

The
South Atlantic Quarterly

The Challenge to Training in Politics

EDWARD JAMES WOODHOUSE

University of North Carolina

For the purposes of this discussion a democracy may be defined broadly as any people or nation consciously seeking real self-government and enjoying governmental institutions based on the theory of government by the consent and will of the governed. The best examples are the United States and the various nations of the British Commonwealth of Nations, but France, Germany, Italy, Czecho-Slovakia, and other states of Europe, as well as the Latin-American nations, are carrying on with varying degrees of success, attempts to attain democratic government. It is unnecessary perhaps to remind the thoughtful reader of the derivation of the term "democracy" from the two Greek words *demos*, meaning the people, and *kratos*, meaning power or rule, but many who talk of democracy do forget its etymological derivation.

"Rule or power of the people" sounds simple and almost unmistakable, but the question immediately arises as to the inclusiveness of the term "people." Who are "the people" so often addressed and appealed to by orators who seldom have settled in their own minds, and still more seldom are willing to admit, how many individuals they would allow to share in the actual control of the "government of the people, for the people and by the people"? To how many citizens did Lincoln favor giving political power through the ballot, when he put into such few and plain words the spirit and meaning of American democracy? Probably the answer is recorded somewhere in his own words, but even if he did not leave to us his exact words on the point in question, we can feel fairly certain, on account of his self-education and of the spirit of his political

convictions, that he agreed with Jefferson, whose teachings he learned and followed so well, in holding that the right to vote should be given to those of normally sound mind, unconvicted of crime and able to read and write. The reason given by Jefferson for favoring this educational prerequisite was that it is necessary to give the voter the possibility of securing the information on which to use the ballot wisely.

But why did Jefferson and Lincoln, and why do we in North Carolina and the other states of the United States to-day, make the circle of those who are to share in the control of the government so wide as to include all who can read and write? Are not the processes of political control most difficult and complex? And should they not, therefore, be committed, as Alexander Hamilton believed and contended, and as his many disciples maintain now, to the hands of the most intelligent few, who would do for the masses, not what the masses want, but what the select group think best for the majority? Most certainly the success of any government is largely dependent upon the kind of men who administer it. As the best machines will not do good work but will actually be ruined under the hands of unskilful workmen, so constitutions, charters and legislative acts cannot set up any political machinery that will operate successfully under ignorant or crooked officers. In spite of the very common misunderstanding and misuse or exaggeration of the phrase "a government of laws and not of men," it is true, as Woodrow Wilson has said, that "no government is a government of laws and not of men, but all governments are governments of men and not of laws." And still we Americans go heedlessly on our way, attempting to remedy every social ill by constitutional amendment, legislative act or judicial decision, and giving comparatively little sustained thought to the selection or subsequent control of those who administer the political instruments. Good workmen will, in time, make their own machinery to suit the needs of their tasks. But unskilled or hostile workmen will misuse and wreck the best machine.

Since it is so supremely important to have the best political officers, and since Jefferson and Lincoln, as reasonable men,

must have agreed with Hamilton to that extent, wherein did they differ from him, from John Adams and the previous, contemporary, and subsequent believers in government by the less intelligent majority as against government by the select minority? The disagreement between those who believe in democracy and those who believe in oligarchy is the crux of the problem; namely, by what process or processes of selection can a nation or the parts thereof be most nearly assured of having in office those who will best conduct the government? But this inquiry necessitates the adoption of standards by which to measure the success of government. Jeremy Bentham, among his various services to Great Britain and the rest of the world, adopted from Priestly, Beccaria or some other writer on political relations, and gave wide currency to the expression "the greatest happiness of the greatest number," as the foundation of his "utilitarian" social philosophy. This phrase, in the form "the greatest good of the greatest number," has become one of the touchstones for testing the approach toward democracy.

What method of selection of public officers is best adapted to secure those who will operate the government for the greatest good of the greatest number? Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Lincoln, and all other true democrats (the term is used here to apply to those who believe in self-government for the mass of the people, and not as applying to a specific political party) have believed that selection of public officers by all, from all, and responsibility of such officers to all, furnish the only security that government will be conducted for the greatest good of all, or at least, of the greatest number. Jefferson said: "The only safe depository of the ultimate political power is the whole body of the people, and, if they make mistakes, the remedy is, not to take the power from them, but to educate them." History confirms the belief of these political thinkers that no other government is safe for the general welfare. Every other and smaller circle than the whole body of the people has sooner or later been demoralized by exclusive political power for any considerable space of time, and degenerated under the special privileges conferred thereby. Every kind of government yet tried by the human race has failed to promote the interests of

all, or even of the majority. Unless some government does satisfy the majority that such government is capable of, and inclined to, work for the common weal, successive revolutions raised by those politically neglected or positively discriminated against, will ultimately destroy our civilization. Democracy is therefore the only hope of that civilization.

Such is the theoretical foundation of the democratic faith, the faith in which Jefferson founded the Democratic Party, first called Republican or Democratic-Republican, and to which Lincoln dedicated the new Republican Party of 1854, calling it by the name first used by his avowed master, Jefferson. But how much has actually been accomplished in the United States in approximating democratic government? How far can we claim to have attained "equal opportunity for all and special privilege for none"?

American governments, national, state, city, town, and county, are entirely controlled by organizations known as political parties. These organizations are almost completely under the dictatorship of small groups of men, or in some places, of single individuals, responsible regularly to no one but themselves, and often conducting government as if it were their own private business. The average voter has practically no voice in the management of these machines which run his government in his name and supposedly in his interest. Let anyone who doubts this, ask himself how much influence he and the members of his family have, individually and collectively, in the political control of his ward, of his city, of his county, of his state, of his nation. We say we are self-governed. Where does that self-government come into our lives if the party machines control our nominations, elections, offices and office-holders? Let us face the facts. Actually, through the instruments known as political parties, we are ruled in local, state, and national affairs by small groups of men, most of whom we have not selected by any process of conscious choice, most of whom we would not select if we had any real voice in the matter; and many of whom neither consult us as to how they should handle our public business nor account to us for the things they have done in our name and ostensibly by our auth-

orization. The American people, who claim to be the freest people, and to have the most democratic government on earth, are, in reality, governed by a complex system of oligarchies, of which their political parties form the parts most difficult to control.

How have such conditions arisen in free America? What are political parties? Whence have they come to us and what should be our relations to them? How may we use them, or other agencies in their stead, in order to regain control of our government? To answer these questions would be too long for such a paper as this. Suffice it to say that the American people have seen four great national parties successively monopolized by those who believe the success, power and prosperity of the fortunate few to mean the national prosperity, and who act accordingly. Federalists, Whigs, Democrats (departing from the principles of Jefferson and of Jackson), successively served the wills of the oligarchs before the Civil War, and the Republican Party, dedicated by Lincoln to promote government of, for and by all the people, has, in turn, yielded to the assaults of the ever-vigilant, selfish few. Its opponents assert that it has gone far beyond any previous American party record in serving the desires and interests of a few against the rights of the many. But it is not the purpose of this paper to engage in such controversy; so suffice it to say that a too long tenure of power has demoralized Democratic and Republican parties successively.

Almost before the election of 1860 was over, the sappers and miners of special privilege were busy intrenching themselves in the new, idealistic Republican Party formed by Lincoln and the other hard-headed Westerners when they had despaired of the two old parties, Democrats and Whigs. Full advantage was taken of war contracts and other profiteering opportunities to demoralize the Republican Party before the end of the War. With Lincoln died the last hope of saving the Party from the hungry horde of special interests seeking shelter, support, and control within its folds. Forty-five years of power over the National Government, out of the last sixty years, have completed the alliance between the spe-

cial interests and the Republican Party. That Party is now without question chiefly occupied in promoting the wishes and supposed interests of the few, at the expense of the rights of the many. But so was the Democratic Party before the Civil War.

The long, lean years out of power since the Civil War and the influence of such leaders and real representatives of the whole people, as Cleveland, Bryan, and Wilson, have partly purified the Democratic Party of the canker of special privilege. But the assured Democratic control of the solid South, and four Democratic National Administrations, have encouraged the seekers of special privilege to try to secure a hold on the Party for the sake of state spoils and in case it should again capture the National Government. Eternal vigilance is the price of maintaining the ideals of the Democratic Party as Jefferson gave them to us, and of the Republican Party of Lincoln, such is the price of real democracy. If government really rests on the consent of the governed, it is not safe for the whole or for any part of this body of possessors of the ultimate sovereignty that any number less than all of them, however large the proportion of the part may be, should lay claim to permanent political control or to the economic supports on which such control must depend. This was the heritage left to his people by the Great Prophet of American Democracy, the greatest political tradition received by the American people from any political leader during its entire history.

Those of us who are old-fashioned enough and obstinate enough to believe in this Eighteenth Century Philosopher and in his theory of democracy, in spite of the many times he has been discredited and his democratic creed rejected by Alexander Hamilton and his followers, share with Jefferson also his conviction that the success of democratic government depends upon the education of all the people using such government. Democracy is impossible without the most enlightened thought of which a whole people are capable. Enlightenment depends upon clear thinking, unshackled by the rules and limitations of any authority, and dominated by the one great aim and purpose

of seeking and knowing the truth. The most vital elements, therefore, in the intellectual equipment of a democracy are clarity and independence of thought.

In a report written by Jefferson in 1818, as a member of a commission appointed by the Governor of Virginia under an act of the General Assembly and including Monroe, then President, Madison and other prominent Virginians, he thus defined the objects of primary education:

1. To give to every citizen the information he needs for the transaction of his own business.
2. To enable him to calculate for himself, and to express and preserve his ideas, his contracts and accounts, in writing.
3. To improve, by reading, his morals and faculties.
4. To understand his duties to his neighbors and country, and to discharge with competence the functions confided to him by either.
5. To know his rights, to exercise with order and justice those he retains; to choose with discretion the fiduciary of those he delegates; to notice their conduct with diligence, with candor and judgment.
6. And, in general, to observe with intelligence and faithfulness all the social relations under which he shall be placed.

If these are the ends, even the ideal aims, of primary education, what would Jefferson have expected, and what ought we to expect, of higher education? How many so-called "educated" men and women begin to measure up today to this ideal written an hundred years ago? Few of us do our own thinking; still fewer are able to express, either in speech or in writing, even the poor thoughts we have. As for possessing a reasonable and relatively adequate understanding of our social relations and of the resulting obligations, we have not yet, as a people, ever felt the need of such knowledge. The recollection of the unwillingness of the average respectable citizen, not only to hold public office (except for greater immediate pecuniary profit than would accrue to him by other available expenditures of the same time and effort) but also to take the trouble to cast his vote carefully and regularly, and the thought of the many crooked or incompetent holders of public offices, great and small, known to any well-informed person, make the most optimistic student of American life feel the magnitude of the educational task to be undertaken and completed before the average

voter will be able "to know his rights, to exercise with order and justice those he retains; to choose with discretion the fiduciary of those he delegates; to notice their conduct with diligence, with candor and judgment." What an ideal of citizenship! What an indirect indictment of present American political life!

Jefferson wrote in this same year, 1818, to J. C. Cabell, and probably in connection with this same Virginia discussion of public education: "A system of general instruction which shall reach every description of our citizens, from the highest to the poorest, as it was the earliest, so it will be the latest, of all the public concerns in which I shall permit myself to take an interest."

That political enlightenment was one of the most prominent aims, perhaps the most prominent, in Jefferson's scheme for public education, is clearly apparent from the emphasis placed in the above-quoted report on political rights and obligations. The study of political and of other social relations must always occupy a large and important place in any successful educational system for any people carrying on the long, slow struggle for democratic government and democratic life. For how can a people control and direct their government effectively unless they understand it as a good machinist knows the machine that does his will? Widespread and thorough political understanding is highly desirable under any government really interested in the general welfare of its people, but it is an absolute necessity under democratic government. Can the text, "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free," find any truer or fuller application or realization than in the evolution of a people trying to govern themselves for the highest ends of human existence?

One of the greatest lacks in American life is the need of systematic political thinking, speaking and writing. Politically we are a nation of indifferent, short-sighted, emotional opportunists. As a people, we have long and persistently refused to devote serious and connected thought to things political, and have insisted upon degrading the words "politics" and "politician" until they are very generally considered terms of re-

proach. No class in the United States, except the professional politicians, study politics, and the great majority of these study it only for their own selfish ends. That the average business man will not only refuse to hold office, but often refrain from taking time or trouble to vote, has become a commonplace and no longer attracts more than occasional and spasmodic attention and condemnation. The corruption and the inefficiency in political affairs have taken their places with the weather as conventional topics of conversation and as things beyond human control. Resigned and virtuous complaint against the hardness of our lot in being governed by our Lorimers, Abe Ruefs, Tweeds, and other convicted criminals, and by our Hylans, Daughertys, Falls, and other political benefactors who so unselfishly (?) spend their time doing for us what we refuse to do for ourselves, that is, control our government, may give us weak comfort but does not prove that we get worse government than we deserve. The fact is that we are not willing to pay the price of good government, namely, eternal care, vigilance, and activity for matters of general concern; and so we pay a higher price for ineffectively poor or actively bad government.

What this country sorely needs is the devotion of more of its alert and aggressive thought and action to its social problems, and especially to the organization and operation of the governmental agencies to which it entrusts matters of general concern. No stream rises without sources, or flows higher than those sources. Before the stream of national political life can become broad and strong, it must be fed by many springs of individual thought and deed. The main stream cannot be purer than its springs; and however clear and full the spring, it cannot affect the river unless connected with it. Individual political morals may be negatively faultless and yet have little or no effect on the community, because the owner does not raise his voice and make his convictions a positive social force. The springs of political thought and of thoughtful action are comparatively few and weak in the United States, and very little connected with each other or with the main stream. The average American voter knows today much less of what knowledge

there is available in matters political than did his predecessor with the ballot an hundred years ago. Politics absorbs a much smaller part of the interest of the potential voter of 1926 than it did in the case of his ancestor of 1826. To what is this condition primarily due? Lack of effective leadership is perhaps the greatest cause of the present political ignorance and indifference. But it may be just as true that the widespread ignorance and indifference are the chief reasons why we have so few and such inadequate leaders in this field. Thus two of the greatest weaknesses of the American people form a vicious circle, and intensify and perpetuate each other.

There is even more need today than when Jefferson wrote his report, of a system of education that will keep the whole people informed and alert as to their government. The political equipment of the nation, which then seemed in a fair way to improve steadily and to reproduce itself in much higher forms, has gradually deteriorated during the last hundred years and is now in urgent need of being completely overhauled, reorganized and connected with some system of educational or other nourishment to make it regularly reproductive in greater amount and in higher quality. Throughout the last half of the Eighteenth Century and perhaps the first quarter of the Nineteenth, the best American brains were devoted to the study and practice of politics; ambitious young men preferred a political career to all others; the great majority of ordinary men, without political opportunity, watched and discussed with great interest the sayings and doings of their more fortunate brethren, just as the man without means to invest, follows today the financial careers of the captains of industry and trust magnates, and of the smaller participants in the business struggle. Politics was then the greatest American game; now business holds that place. Beginning about 1830 or 1840, perhaps even earlier, the business of money-making has engrossed more and more the attention and efforts of the best American minds, and has gradually absorbed the professions. Men no longer study Government and Law as preparation for careers in politics from which they expect to retire poorer than when they entered the political arena, as Jefferson and many of his contemporaries

did expect and did retire. Now, Law and Politics are merely remunerative businesses and are so considered and so treated by those engaged in them or in any other business. The struggle is no longer for name and fame through leadership and service, with wealth as a mere means for more leadership and more service and for a greater political career, but rather now for money, and more money, and social prestige thereby acquired. The American people are no worse now than were their predecessors from 1750 to 1825, but certainly their standards of value have, in this respect, become less highly social and much less admirable.

The masses have naturally and inevitably followed the example of the outstanding figures in American thought and action. The aims and ideals of leaders and of followers are commercial. The average citizen would much prefer to be a Morgan, a Rockefeller, a Schwab, a Carnegie, a Harriman, or a Van Sweringen, than a Woodrow Wilson; an Abraham Lincoln, a Washington or a Jefferson. Politics has suffered accordingly. Can anyone name today, in either of the great political parties, men of the quality and prominence of Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, the three sages of their party in the 1820's? Of Chief Justice Marshall, then the high priest of Federalism and national supremacy; of John Adams, then still living and perhaps more respected and admired than when he had been President? Of Calhoun, John Quincy Adams, Webster, Henry Clay, Andrew Jackson, and William H. Crawford, who had succeeded the older leaders in political control? In Virginia alone, at that time, John Randolph of Roanoke, William B. Giles, John Taylor of Caroline, Spencer Roane, Chief Justice of Virginia, Thomas Ritchie and Littleton Waller Tazewell were probably as able as the average of the more prominent men just named. Similar lists could be made of striking contemporary political leaders in other states. Now states and nation are almost bankrupt in political leadership.

When the best political thought was to be found in the speeches and writings of the leaders of political action, the best school of politics consisted in association with these leaders. The best thinking, speaking and writing on politics in the earlier

part of the Nineteenth Century was done in active political life, by men in the halls of Congress; in the President's chair; in the Cabinet; in the governorships; in the editorial chairs of political journals such as the *Richmond Enquirer*, *Niles' Register*, and the newspapers of the National Capital. These students of the science of government took the time and trouble to think out and write down their political philosophies, with the realization that such creeds would be mercilessly analyzed and attacked by the best minds of the day. John Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Alexander Hamilton, John Quincy Adams, Marshall, Calhoun, and Webster, were recognized nationally and internationally as among the foremost political scientists of their day. They knew surprising proportions of what had been worked out and written on American History and Government and were making great additions to that literature. They were likewise acquainted with the histories and governments of the British Empire and of the other nations of the world. These reserve funds of information gave them bases for comparison and judgment in thinking, speaking, and writing of their own government.

What men in American public life today know enough of the history or of the government of their own or of any other country to speak or write intelligently of any parts thereof, except the narrow field in which their own actual experience was gained, or to speak with authority of the parts of American government with which they have been immediately connected. They are not apt to know even the literature of their own fields sufficiently well to find their way around without aid. A district judge of the United States once lectured on the power of American courts to declare legislative acts unconstitutional and his address showed that he not only was unacquainted with the contents of the striking expositions by McLaughlin, Beard, and Corwin of the doctrine of Judicial Review, but that he did not even know of the existence of these works. A book published within the last three years by a former justice of a State Supreme Court, emphasizing this same characteristic American power of the courts, showed equal innocence of knowledge of the three books mentioned above and of the more recent and

still more comprehensive book of Haines on the same subject. A volume of addresses by a recent state governor naïvely and seriously discusses "natural and inalienable rights" as if the really scientific and scholarly thinkers and writers in the field of the Social Sciences had not for the last twenty-five years been almost unanimous in agreeing that all rights, powers, privileges and immunities are not "natural," "inalienable," or "absolute," but relative to the circumstances under which they are claimed and are held subject to the will of society and to its power and privilege of withdrawing such individual rights, powers, privileges and immunities whenever it is for the general welfare so to do. The same writer speaks of "a government of laws and not of men," as if modern political thought had not clearly shown that no such government has ever existed or is apt to exist on this earth with its present inhabitants, and that all known human governments depend for their characteristics, not on the forms of their constitutions and laws, but on the characters and abilities of the men who conduct them. A story is told of an ex-President of the United States since the Civil War, who had to make an address on George Washington and who wandered around a library wondering where he could find something on the Father of his Country. He was finally rescued from his uncertainty when a college professor suggested the works of Washington, some of the best of the many biographies, and some of the best general historical works dealing with Washington and his time.

These are merely instances selected from among a great number of similar bits of evidence that tend to show a general condition of ignorance among public men, not only of the history, but even of the government of the country which they help to govern. The number of men in public office in the United States, since the Civil War, who have made important contributions to the literature of American government is remarkably small. Most students of the subject would agree in naming Mr. Wilson, Mr. Root, and Mr. Justice Holmes, but it is most difficult to add other names on which there would be general agreement.

The best treatments of political subjects come now from men in academic life, and, instead of having the whole nation as an audience, as did the leaders of American political thought a century ago, their audience is confined to a small circle of students and of other teachers scattered among the too few colleges and universities that offer even a fair opportunity for the study of government. How the mighty art of government, "the royal art," Mr. Bryan has called it, has fallen from its high place as one of the subjects of the greatest American interest! From a height where it was the chief study of the first six Presidents, of their advisers, of at least two of the first Chief Justices of the Federal Supreme Court (Jay and Marshall), of state governors, senators and congressmen, it has descended to a place in college and university catalogues and curricula inferior to the places of the "natural sciences," of most languages, of Philosophy, of Psychology, of Mathematics, of Art, of Music, of History, of Economics, indeed of practically all other subjects studied in colleges and universities. Some institutions do not even include this fallen monarch, except in disguise under history and other still respectable names, in their lists of those at whose feet students may sit.

And what of those upon whom have fallen the mantles of the great political leaders and teachers of America during its first fifty years of national existence? What of the instructors who preside over the pitifully few class rooms that have succeeded the halls of Congress, the state legislatures and the courts, the offices of presidents, governors, senators, congressmen and judges, as the laboratories for the formulation and testing of political ideas? Working under tremendous disadvantages, they have produced within the past forty or fifty years a literature on American politics, surprising in its mass, scope and quality.

But few of them teach as well as they write. As do most teachers, they become dogmatic, forget that the primary purpose of all education is (as its etymological derivation from *e* and *duco* implies) to draw out the students' powers, to train them to think and to express their thoughts in speech and in writing, rather than to accept blindly and to memorize as many

as possible of the facts and conclusions set before them in books and lectures. And so these guides of the future leaders of the nation become too much impressed with the importance of their own political interpretations of complex social conditions, and demand that students spend their time and energy in learning by rote the views of the instructor instead of becoming acquainted with the varying views of the best writers in the field and of acquiring by practice, ability and readiness to form and express their own views.

It is so much easier for the pedagogue to use the mediaeval method of laying down the law in lectures, as if his opinions had been or could be mathematically proven, and of using occasional written examinations to make sure that the victims are respectfully preserving the dogmatic judgments, than to pursue the much more difficult Socratic method of asking questions and directing the discussion so as to let the students do as much as possible of the thinking and talking. If this is the training on which men and women must depend for arousing their powers of leadership in political thought, small wonder that very, very few from such courses ever show the clearness of vision, the independence of decision, or the missionary zeal necessary to any Moses who is to lead the people out of a wilderness of political perplexities. Nor is it remarkable that the college men in public life are as devoid of insight into social relations as are those without college training.

Dogmatism and its mediaeval correlative of subservience to authority are as likely to produce numbers of self-reliant thinkers as continued infantile spoon-feeding would be to develop full-grown men and women. Naturally, when the youthful mind is kept busy receiving, labelling and storing away for future reference the number of detailed facts and pre-determined professorial conclusions, all too common in college and university courses, there is little time or energy left for learning by practice to dig out facts for one's self and to analyze, correlate and interpret them independently. Students in these lecture courses cannot be allowed to spend their efforts in becoming acquainted at first-hand with much of the literature of the subject, lest they might not be able to receive and give back

inviolate the revelations of the instructor. And memory-testing "fact courses" demand for these "facts," (marshalled in such masses and interpreted with such certainty and finality in the lectures of the divinely-inspired deciders of all debatable questions, but largely disproven or re-interpreted by the discoveries of each generation,) so much concentration that the students have little opportunity for developing independent viewpoints, opinions, methods of thought, or of expression. Naturally this catechismic method of instruction requires reading assignments not too voluminous or too difficult to be exactly committed to memory. We hear much of books as too long or too difficult for college courses in government, as if it were desirable to select books possible of understanding without effort and of absorption by students to the last details.

A recent book on our National Government, probably the best treatment of the subject, the ripe result of years of successful teaching, and one introducing a viewpoint and an emphasis, that is the presentation of the law of the National Government—almost as new in 1920 as the realistic emphasis and viewpoint of Mr. Wilson's Congressional Government in 1885—has been greeted by some critics, themselves college and university teachers of American Government, as too difficult for college students! Too difficult for the disgracefully small number of those who must be relied upon to spread among the American people the systematic views, analyses and criticisms of the people's government being worked out in seclusion by the cloistered students who have succeeded the Jeffersons, the Adamsses, the Hamiltons, the Marshalls and the Lincolns as the guardians and expositors of American political traditions and ideals! It would be interesting to hear the comment of John Quincy Adams, master of sarcasm that he was, on the contention that any true description of the theory and practice of American Government is too difficult for the young men and women who must leaven the great mass of the one hundred and ten millions and lead them away from the Len Smalls, the Cole Bleases, the Jim Fergusons and others of that ilk!

The colleges and universities in America must supply the kind of education that will enable the American people to be

increasingly able to exercise wisely the great right of self-government. Democracy is impossible without the fullest and most careful study, and the clearest possible understanding of the relations of human beings to each other. These human social relations are without any exception the most important subjects for study in a democracy. Until our educational institutions shall do very much more in this direction than they are doing at present, they cannot claim to be making even a beginning of living up to the noble words over the gate of the University of Virginia, "Enter here and seek the way of honor, the light of truth, and the will to work for men."

Is the American Negro to Remain Black or Become Bleached?

KELLY MILLER

Howard University

Is the Negro race to preserve its physical identity or to be bleached white within any calculable time with which we need now concern ourselves? A satisfying answer to this query would not only go a long way towards relieving the American mind of a perplexing anxiety, but would also greatly facilitate practical and acceptable plans of race adjustment. The American white man has been so earnestly engaged in volunteer assistance to Providence to keep the races apart that he has failed to notice the plain indications of the outcome under the normal operation of biological and social law. A new Negroid type is gradually emerging which clearly foreshadows the immediate, if not the ultimate, physical destiny of the Negro race on this continent.

The world is now giving concern to the outcome of the contact, attrition and adjustment of the various races and nations of mankind in a more serious sense than it has ever done before. Easy transportation of material substance and the free communicability of ideas have brought the ends of the earth together in one human community. No longer do mountains, rivers and seas form fixed boundaries for human habitation. But according to the universal experience of mankind, race contact means race admixture. The primal passion of sex runs deeper than racial or cultural cleavage. Race antipathy, religious inhibition, social proscription and cultural pretensions, all break down in face of the cosmic urge to multiply and replenish the earth. The laws of biology care little for the decrees of the propagandist or the sanction of priests. Historically, the admixture of races has taken place despite the prevailing social polity, and mainly outside of the marriage vow. When two races of wide-apart levels are brought together, there is a mixed offspring without certified paternity. The stigma of illegitimacy is visited upon the children of natural passion unto the third and fourth generation, until the

process of fusion has been completed without trace. The process of race fusion is of no sociological importance beyond the time when the brand of bastardy begets an unfavorable social opinion. What boots it how the Anglo-Saxon came to be; whether the original fusion of blood was with or without the sanction of civil or ceremonial law? The important fact remains, that he is what he is. The census of 1890 recorded nearly seventy thousand octoroons in the United States. Practically all of these can cross, and many of them have crossed, the great race divide, carrying with them their quatum of Negro blood. That these octoroons were begotten through the process of bastardy, makes absolutely no difference in the final effect upon the blood composition of the American people. Our statesmen in their frantic efforts to keep the races apart by statutes and civil regulations should bear in mind that comprehensively, in the long run, miscegenation without the law will be just as effectual as miscegenation under sanction of law.

The composite progeny is always the offspring of the males of the stronger and the females of the weaker race. The sons of God never fail to look lustfully upon the daughters of men. By the instinct of male jealousy, the males of the lower or lesser breed are forbidden personal or social intimacy with the females of the higher race and class. The same law of sexual jealousy would impel the males of the inferior order to give like shelter and protection to their own womenfolk, but they lack the power to give their purpose force and effectiveness.

The dominant white sentiment in America abominates race admixture so far as the European and the African are concerned. Indeed, this is the general attitude of the white towards the non-white portions of the human race, which is most assertive in the Northern European or Nordic type. This feeling has been greatly accentuated in America since the end of the World War. Rabid propaganda has been stimulated and fostered. The resources of science have been ransacked for proof of the evil effect of race fusion. The discarded argument based upon an exploded theory of divine purpose has been resurrected and made to do service for the new propaganda. Men are ever prone to interpret facts to sustain their notions and to fashion their opinions to suit their prejudices. While science has given

no final word as to the effect of race intermixture upon the physical, intellectual and moral stamina of the offspring, yet the rabid advocates of race purity are asserting the baneful effects of such crossing, with the assumed authority of scientific certitude. The physical separateness of the races is the one passionate dogma which dominates the American mind today. Its sanction is stronger than that of science, law or religion. Race consciousness is growing keener and keener with the passing years. Physical distinction counts for more than cult or creed. The test of an ennobling brotherhood is determined by birth of the flesh rather than birth of the spirit. The white Christian must, by the essential requirement of his creed, assent to the doctrine of the equality of the soul, but he stubbornly balks at the suggestion of social equality. All sorts of devices are used to keep the races physically separate and socially asunder. Twenty-six states have passed anti-miscegenation laws. Separate schools and jimcrow regulations are made in the southern states where the Negro resides in greatest relative proportion. Custom and tradition forbid social intermingling by a sanction stronger than law. The Mongolian is placed under the same ban as the Negro. Facts can always be found and arguments fashioned to support dominant opinion. If the undesirable element be black, like the Negro, it must be excluded on the ground of inferiority which threatens general debasement. If it be yellow, like the Japanese, it meets with like treatment on the grounds of suspected equality, or even superiority. So feeble is the force of logic against the avowed dominant purpose. The continuance of this intolerant spirit on the part of the white race in America is as certain as any other social tendency concerning which we now have predictive data. It is with this attitude that we have to deal and against which, as a background, we must project all projects and plans for better race relations.

The white man is primarily responsible for whatever race crossing has already taken place, or that threatens to take place in the future. Emerson somewhere says that no man can come near me except by my own act. The Negro woman has been victimized. The approximation of the races is the result. Should the white race issue a decree enforceable upon every

member of that blood, that there shall be no further intermingling of the races, the process would instantly cease. But instead, the burden of blame is sought to be placed upon the victimized race which bears the brunt of it all. One is again reminded of Aesop's wolf, accusing the lamb of muddying the stream from the lower level. There would be no need of drastic legislation, passionate assertion of determination, rabid propaganda and aroused rancor of race, if the white man's race pride could control his sex passion. But this is perhaps placing too great an inhibition upon human nature. Penelope, the wife of Ulysses, in the *Odyssey* kept her suitors in indefinite suspense by promising to render a final decision when she had completed knitting a fancy fabric. But the fidelity of her heart and the cunning of her mind led her to unravel at night the newly knitted section of the preceding day. So the answer was delayed until the return of her faithful spouse. The white man defeats by his lustful indulgences by night all of his finely spun theories of race purity elaborated by day.

The fact that sex urge is a deeper and more profound instinct than race preference, or race pride, should lead to serious reflection as to the permanence of race consciousness as the dominant influence in human relationships. Nor is this the only passion that often rises above the distinctions of race. Political and patriotic fervor and religious zeal have often evinced a force and stubbornness that swept away all barriers of flesh and blood. The rise of Islam and its threatened renaissance show the possibility of the dominance of the spirit over the flesh. The basic principle of Christianity requires detachment of devotion and a strength of discipleship which transcend all racial animosities and antagonisms. The religion of the Nazarene, in its pure essence, recognizes neither Jew nor Greek, Barbarian nor Scythian, bondmen nor freemen. Christianity is absolutely incompatible with caste or color. The attempt to reconcile the gospel of Jesus with the arrogant intolerance of the Nordic is a serious reflection upon the spiritual capacity of the Teutonic race, whose genius for concrete practical accomplishments is to be extolled beyond all praise. Spiritual kinship transcends all human and social relations among mankind.

In regarding the spirit of race intolerance as a fixed stubborn fact which conditions our present day policies, let it always be understood that we are dealing only with the present and the glimpse of future time now vouchsafed to us. Human shortsightedness cannot envisage the far reaching future. Our wisest foresight, like the head light of an engine, can see only a few furlongs in advance. The power of human prophecy is feeble; nor does it increase with general progress and advancement. No human being knows what a day may bring forth any more than he did in the days of Noah's Flood. Had any soothsayer predicted the present state of the world twelve years ago, he would have been ranked with the amiable fanatics who ever and anon amuse us with prophecies of the end of time. We are equally impotent to foretell the political, economic or social condition of the world a short ten years hence. The sudden emergence of deep seated moral and spiritual emotional propaganda may sweep away the sensibilities of race, and usher in a new order of things based upon more primal human passion.

All profound religious teachers and deep social thinkers base their hopes upon the social, moral and spiritual unity of mankind, as "the one far off divine event, to which the whole creation moves." According to any comprehensive and satisfying philosophy, the brotherhood of man is more fundamental than the fellowship of race. The ultimate physical and social identity of all peoples occupying a common territory is a logical necessity of thought. The straight-thinking mind, free from predilections and social bias, refuses to give assent to any other conclusion. This consummation, however, is too far removed from the sphere of present day sensibilities to have much appreciable effect upon practical procedure in this prosaic, work-a-day world in which we live. We are mainly motivated by apparent, persistent, stubborn realities which we can neither defeat nor frustrate. In our helplessness we are forced to deal with conditions as they are, rather than as we vaguely or vainly imagine they ought to be, or as we may cherish the hope they will be in the ages yet to come. To be regarded as a time-server is often considered as a designation of reproach; but finite comprehension can only serve its day and generation. It

requires omniscience to serve eternity. The deepest race distinctions in the world prevail in Christendom, which recognizes neither race nor color. But a pragmatic policy must deal with existing realities rather than with idealized abstractions. We must discuss the physical destiny of the Negro race in America, under the Christian dispensation as it prevails now on the earth, rather than according to some idealistic interpretation that has never yet been practicalized on land or sea.

In the United States the original red race is rapidly being extinguished by the encroachment of a too strenuous civilization. The yellow race is excluded by drastic immigration restrictions calculated to keep America white, or as nearly white as may be, with the troublesome non-white elements now on hand. The white and black races will be the residuary constituents of the population of the continental United States. America has been called the great international melting pot in which the various nationalities of Europe are to be fused into one homogeneous type. This process, however, is supposed to include only the different branches of the Aryan race. The white race alone is deemed a worthy component of the desired compound. The non-white races of Africa, Asia, and the scattered isles of the sea, are not considered as contributory factors of the forthcoming American race. But the rejected elements are also being fused into ethnic solidarity, which is basically Negroid. There will be, not one American race, but two; the one white, and the other neither white nor black, but a brownish-yellow or a yellowish-brown.

The term Negro is used to designate a group of peoples whose maternal ancestors came from Africa. It involves all of the complexities of blood and varieties of color of the entire human family. There is no race variety on the face of the globe that is not represented through some trace of its blood in this new Negroid type, now in process of fusion. While the term Negro denotes color, it also connotes condition and status. The social segregation of the Negro race, together with all who bear marks of physical semblance thereto, is made easy by reason of its traditional servile relationship. The color line constitutes the deepest and most easily distinguishable line of cleavage in our cosmopolitan population. All elements of the

white race are the more consciously and agreeably solidified by appeal to the antithetic colored race. In Europe, where they have no such racial antithesis, intra-racial divisions and strife are far more sharp and acrimonious. The division of mankind into Jew and Gentile, Greek and Barbarian, Christian and Heathen, white and colored, rests upon the basis of contrasted cultures. Those who belong to the higher assumption feel themselves drawn closer together by reason of the superior conceit which lifts them above the level of the baser groups that fall without the circle of their coveted ennoblement. The phrase "white and colored" is relished as a talismanic expression which distinguishes the white man from his less favored and more unfortunate fellow creatures.

The American Negro does not constitute a race in the sense of a compact ethnic unity, imbued with a common consciousness and impelled by a common impulse. There is no sufficiently unified physical basis as a background for the emergence of a collective soul with the passion and stubbornness to compel coördinated action and persistent procedure. There is rather a promiscuous assortment of individuals with diverse physical and spiritual dispositions, actuated by the antagonistic instincts of the Ishmaelite. The imported slaves represented disjunct and expatriated individuals, captured from wide apart areas of the African continent, and representing tribes that differed widely in cult and color. The process of transplantation covered the period of two centuries. The enslaved captives, if they had ever acquired, had doubtless lost a patriotic devotion to country and native land. There was no social sense of the wrongs and injustice involved in their capture, enslavement and expatriation. For the most part they were slaves or captives in their native land. To them, crossing the ocean was merely shifting the scene of their misfortune from one continent to another.

Psychologists tell us that group consciousness emerges most readily and is most easily sustained on a basis of physical likeness. The wide distribution of the African slaves in time and space, and the vastly varying social circumstances of their native land, made of them an aggregation of unrelated assortment of unfortunates, united only by the bond of a servile status

and a somewhat similar color. These unfortunate children of nature were divested of every semblance of self expression and development, along the line of their natural bent and genius. The alien master directed every move they made and controlled the channels of intra-communication. Wherever two or three of them were gathered together, a white man was placed in their midst to confound their spontaneous council and to frustrate the formulation of a common purpose. There never was more unpromising material and untoward circumstances out of which to build up and develop a race.

The white race began to mix its blood with that of the Negro with the landing of the first ship load at Jamestown. From that day to this the sun has never set and risen without the reinforcement of European blood in African veins. In the beginning, this libidinous miscegenation was wholly without social consciousness. It was only when a considerable body of mulattoes appeared that the philosophers and statesmen of that day began to animadvert upon the possible future jeopardy of a half-caste issue. Even now, the effect that the absence of the mulatto might have had on race relations is a matter of curious but interesting speculation. We are told in Greek mythology that Father Chronos devoured the offspring of his lust in order to avoid future complications of a troublesome issue. The white race in America sought the same end by relegating the mixed issue to the status of the mother's race. This policy served, for the time being, to keep the white race legally pure while mixing the Negro race. But here again the inexorable laws of biology proved to be stronger and more effective than the cunning legal contrivance of man. The Latin races, on the other hand, incorporate the composite progeny into the dominant race, which becomes frankly mixed, ostensibly leaving the lower and weaker element pure. The immediate effect of the pragmatic policy of the Teuton proves to be more agreeable to his asserted pride of race; but in the cosmic scheme of ethical requirement, the time must come for a reckoning for the awful sin of imposing the consequences of the lustful burden of one race upon another. Theodore Roosevelt, in one of his contributions from South America, raised the query as to whether the Teutonic or the Latin policy would lead sooner to final and

IB

satisfactory race adjustment. But like Pontius Pilot, in his query as to the nature of truth, he did not vouchsafe an answer. The Negro woman is made to bear the brunt of all of the races, nations, and varieties of mankind now living or sojourning in this country.

In the veins of the so-called Negro race, there courses some strain of the blood of every known subdivision of the human family. Not only within the limits of the same race itself, but within the veins of the same individual, strains of blood are mixed and mingled in inextricable confusion. Indeed, if there be such a thing as natural race antipathy, the Negro race would be rent asunder by internal and external animosities.

The physical destiny of the Negro race is not immediate amalgamation with the white race, but the blending of these diverse bloods into something like physical homogeneity, and the formulation of a group consciousness upon a substantial basis of physical solidarity. If this was not a normal tendency, enlightened race statesmanship would make it a conscious policy. The integrity of an outcast and self-despised race never has been, and never can be, preserved. The Negro in America will either be bleached by bastardy or destroyed through debauchery unless it develops a leadership and an *amor propre*, proudly conscious of its place and mission in the general scheme of human advancement. The Jewish race has preserved its physical purity through four thousand years, though densely crowded and envired by an unfriendly gentile world. And yet the unsanctioned overflow of Hebrew blood has enriched the veins of every race and nation among whom the chosen people have dwelt since the days of Abraham. The integrity of the breed, however, has been maintained by religious sanction rather than by any biological promptings or physical racial instinct.

The quickest and perhaps the easiest solution of the race problem in America would be the immediate physical absorption of the Negro element into the white race. Were the quantum of black blood evenly diffused throughout, the resulting blend would average eleven-twelfths white. This would meet the legal definition of a white person in several southern states and would represent as slight a strain of Negro blood as

can be traced with any scientific or practical certainty. There is no proved precedent or convincing argument that the physical, intellectual, or moral result would be deteriorative. This result, however, is not probable and hardly possible, in face of the fixed and determined attitude of the white race which controls the situation. Nor would it be the most helpful solution, so far as the world problem of race contact and adjustment is concerned. To absorb a handful of Negroes in America and leave the unbleached millions of Africa in their savage blackness, would be to deepen the gulf of racial cleavage as a world problem. It would be worse than useless from a sociological point of view for the whites of the Pacific Coast to absorb the few hundred thousand Mongolians now sojourning in their midst, and leave the half billion yellow Asiatics confronting them from the other side of the sea. If there is any divine purpose in working out the universal plan of racial amity and good will throughout the world, it would not be promoted by the immediate amalgamation either of the Negro or the Mongolian fragments now living in America.

The attitude of the Negro race towards amalgamation can have only a negative effect. The more anxious he seems to bring about amalgamation, the more certainly will he help to defeat its consummation. The weaker race can destroy its separate identity only by a process of complaisant prostitution, whose ethical implications are too repugnant to be contemplated as a serious racial policy. The American Negro will be forced by outside compulsion to maintain his social and physical identity, independent of any purpose or policy on his part. The Negro will thus become one with himself long before he becomes one with the American people.

While we muse, the fire burns. A new sub-race variety is forming under our very eyes. The future Negro race in America will be neither black nor white, but a yellowish-brown with albicant tendency. The federal census shows unmistakably the direction in which the wind is blowing. The mulatto element has steadily increased over the black from the earlier decades to the present time. Strictly speaking, the term Mulatto includes only the first offspring of Negro and European parentage; but according to census definition it includes all Negroes

with a perceptible trace of white blood. Due allowances must be made for discrepant definitions of the several censuses and also of the ability or inclination of the enumerators to differentiate finely as to shades of color and degrees of blood composition. The Negro himself can furnish no trustworthy data. Frederick Douglass used to say that genealogical trees did not flourish among slaves. The census of 1890 defined as "black" all persons having three-fourths or more of black blood. This is perhaps as close a margin as the average enumerator would be able to estimate. After passing the three-fourths limit, in case of the black quadroon as of the white quadroon, the individual would normally be classed with the race from which he derived the preponderance of his blood. The Fourteenth Census shows that there were 1,660,534 mulattoes in the United States in 1920, as against 2,050,686 in 1910. This discrepancy may be accounted for by the probability that part of the number returned as mulattoes in 1910 were classed as white in 1920, and partly by the larger probability that many more of them had been swallowed up by the mass-life of the race and returned as black.

The rapid growth of the mulatto element is not due in any great degree to its inherent fecundity. The mulatto birth rate is probably lower and the death rate higher than that of the blacks, under similar conditions of living. Every fresh infusion of white blood increases the proportional strength of the mulatto element. The Negro offspring of white parentage may be regarded as a continuing, though a gradually diminishing, factor in the equation of the colored population. There is not likely to be much further fresh infusion of white blood into the Negro race. Under the institution of slavery, the Negro woman was suppressed below the level of self-respect. She often felt her enhanced importance by becoming the mother of a mulatto child. The white master or overseer felt no legal, social or conscientious restraint in victimizing the female chattel. Had this institution continued another two hundred years without fresh importation of blacks from the continent of Africa, the race would have become well bleached through this libidinous process. But the growing sense of self-respect on the part of the Negro, as well as the increasing restraints of law and con-

science on the part of the white man, have checked, if not halted, this bastardizing process. The establishment of domestic ties and family pride in colored society effectively forbids such illicit relations, and makes social outcasts of the illegitimate issue. The laws of twenty-six states forbid the intermarriage of the races, which absolutely estops legitimate mulatto offspring. The states in which the bulk of the Negroes reside are found within this number. The social sensibilities of the races have grown so delicate, even in the North, that intermarriage has become exceedingly rare, even where there were no forbidding laws. The residential segregation of the Negro will lessen the opportunity of intimate contact of the races and therefore of illicit offspring. Illicit relations will decrease in proportion to the extension of separate areas of racial domicile. The rise of the "sage femme" and the widely advertised practice of race suicide, also serve to limit the fresh production of mulattoes. There are few mulatto babies born in Harlem, or in Philadelphia, Chicago or Detroit.

Of the 1,660,000 colored persons returned as mulattoes in the census of 1920, and of more than as many more with concealed white blood in their veins, the overwhelming majority, especially of the younger generation, are offspring of colored fathers and mothers. There is already a large quantity of white blood in Negro veins. This blood tends to diffuse itself equally throughout the whole mass until it shall have assumed an approximate oneness in color and physical likeness. The process of diffusion will be greatly facilitated by the well known tendency of the darker male to mate with the lighter female. A homochrome marriage within the colored race is unusual.

The obvious proneness of the male for the lighter female is set forth by Paul Laurence Dunbar in his allusion to "the swarthy maid with her swarthier swain."

Many thousand Negroes have crossed, are now crossing, and in the future will cross, the great racial and social divide, and incorporate themselves into the white race, in order to escape the nether status of their mother blood. It is needless to denounce or condemn this clandestine tendency. They are pursuing the normal human motive of self interest and personal advantage. These racial transmigrants carry with them as

much of the despised blood as can easily be concealed under an albicant skin and unkinking hair. The white race will take only such homeopathic dashes of Negro blood as to remain substantially pure, at least in outward semblance. The transposition of the quadroon and the octoroon will tend to widen the physical margin between the races, and will also facilitate the more rapid diffusion of the residuary white blood throughout the Negro race.

214 A careful observation of Negro schools, churches, and other assemblages, in all parts of the country, convinces the writer that fully three-fourths of the rising generation have some noticeable infusion of white blood. One finds about as many children of undiluted Negro type as of the opposite extreme who cannot easily be detected from white. Both extremes, however, are rapidly diminishing in quantity, while the average of the race is approaching a medium of color and physical characteristics. Within the next three or four generations it will be hard to find a pure blooded Negro outside the remote black belts of the rural South. The near whites will have crossed the line or bred backward on the color scale. A new Negroid race will have arisen.

Thus a clear indication of the physical destiny of the Negro element in America ought to enable us to deal more effectively with the complicated and perplexing problem. The welding together of this incoherent racial group into a compact physical and social unity, to awaken a race consciousness and to inspire a concerted purpose of coöperation with the larger white group in all the ways of civilization and human advancement, ought to engage the highest energies of Negro leadership and to enkindle its keenest enthusiasm for human service. On the other hand, it ought to free the white man from the frantic dread of amalgamation and race debasement which now harrasses his waking hours and haunts him in his dreams.

Ambrose Bierce: The Gray Wolf of American Letters

LEROY J. NATIONS
Columbia University

THE MAN

In life and death Ambrose Bierce was inexplicable. "He is," said the poet Edwin Markham, who knew him well, "a composite mind—a blending of Hafiz the Persian, Swift, Poe, Thoreau, with sometimes a gleam of the Galilean." Franklin K. Lane once spoke of him as "a hideous monster, so like the mixture of dragon, lizard, bat, and snake, as to be unnameable." Bill Nye held him to be the originator of all our brands of humor; Gladstone praised his witticisms; Gertrude Atherton admired his one novel; George Sterling, the poet, called him Master; William Randolph Hearst engaged him for many years as a columnist; Walter Jerrold referred to him as one of the four great tellers of the American short story; H. L. Mencken remarked that he was the first wit of America; while Bierce thought of himself as primarily a satirist. Few American men of letters have been more versatile than he.

Ambrose Bierce, the son of Marcus Aurelius and Laura (Sherwood) Bierce, was born in Meigs County, Ohio, June 24, 1842. He was one of eleven children, all of whose Christian names began with the letter A. His education in the backwoods school, precariously snatched between crop seasons, was incomplete and desultory, but his father had a good library and the boy read widely in it. Perhaps he would have moved on West to the homestead of 160 acres, which was the inalienable right of every American youth of the vast nineteenth century democracy of opportunity, had not the Civil War intrigued his youthful imagination.

In 1861, when he was but nineteen years of age, he enlisted with the Federal forces and saw service at Chickamauga, Shiloh, Murfreesboro, Kenesaw Mountain, Franklin, and Nashville. Bierce was a dashing soldier: he was brevetted Major for distinguished valour upon the field of action. He was twice

wounded,—once in the foot, and once in the head—the latter wound, according to a brother, leaving a bit of iron in his brain which embittered him for the remainder of his life.

When the Civil War was over, he went to San Francisco where lived his favorite brother, Albert. Here he became editor of *The News Letter*. It was a day of fierce invective in journalism, and Bierce entered into its savagery with a gusto which would have caused his death had he not been a very brave man.

As Joaquin Miller had done, and Bret Harte was later to do, he went to London in 1872. "Bitter" Bierce they called him there. Scotson Clark once did an admirable portraiture of him for *Black and White*, drawing a rapier-like pen from scabbard with a cavalier flourish. His coterie of friends—George Augusta Sala, Tom Hood the younger, Captain Mayne Reid, and Joaquin Miller—regarded him as dictator. His decisions brooked no questioning; his judgment upon most matters was accepted with finality. "We worked too hard," said Bierce of these London days, "dined too well, frequented too many clubs, and went to bed too late in the afternoon. In short we diligently, conscientiously, and with a perverse satisfaction burned the candle at both ends and in the middle."

For four years he was a member of the staff of *Fun*, edited by the younger Tom Hood, where he achieved the reputation of being an incomparable satirist—a reputation which was recognized by the exiled Empress Eugénie when she chose him as editor of *The Lantern*, which was published with the sole purpose of attacking Henri de Rochefort, her arch enemy. Of this experience Bierce observed: "I am probably the only American journalist who was ever employed by an Empress in so congenial a pursuit as the pursuit of another journalist."

In 1876 he returned to San Francisco, where (with the exception of a year as manager of a mining company near Deadwood, South Dakota) he lived for the next twenty-five years. He earned a livelihood by contributing to the *Wasp*, a publication whose nature is revealed by its name, and by conducting several columns in a department of the San Francisco Sunday *Examiner* called "Prattle, a Transient Record of Individual Opinion." In the words of Bailey Millard, editor of the *Cosmopolitan*, this was "the most wickedly clever, the most audaci-

ously personal and the most eagerly devoured column of causerie that was ever printed in this country." For this work Hearst paid him fifty dollars a column—a fabulous sum in those days.

During the San Francisco years, Bierce was at the height of his powers. He could shatter a reputation with a heroic couplet; he could sing a paean of praise with a shortened phrase. The most feared, the best beloved man on the Pacific Coast, there were those who called him Satan, and there were those who called him Master.

Bierce was of imperial bearing, and cavalier beauty. His friends still speak of his deep blue steel-like eyes, his curly crown of tawny hair, his voice of haughty taciturnity. Almost six feet in height, his compact, well-knit figure gave the impression of clean-cut strength and restrained power. This appearance of rugged manhood Bierce never lost; when at the age of seventy-two he crossed the Rio Grande, he was as well preserved as an English country squire.

He was much admired by the literary crowd of San Francisco, and he, in turn, was on friendly relations with most of them; but he did not often frequent the Bohemian resorts. He was fond of knocking about the city alone. One night he invaded Laurel Hill Cemetery and lay down upon a grave stone to gaze at the dancing lights around the bay and the steady stars above. Hours later he awoke, enveloped by the sea fog, and thoroughly chilled. Asthma was contracted from this exposure, and for years he had to live in the higher altitudes of Napa Valley, venturing down into the lowlands at the peril of bodily ills. Undoubtedly this acute suffering increased his impatience with men and men's affairs: from his residence in the hills he came to look upon life in the plains below as something of a sardonic spectacle. Other troubles he had, too. He was separated from his wife; one of his sons was killed in a drunken brawl; the other was wild and self-willed. He experienced much difficulty in bringing out his books; some of them were plagiarized and his first ventures came to grief with the financial failures of publishing houses. He became wary of strangers, and suspicious of friends.

George Sterling, who was a comrade during this trying period, relates an incident which reveals the intimate character of the man. It seems that Bierce's son, Leigh, had entered into a liaison with an Oakland girl, which caused his father no little pain. The elder Bierce was resolved that the affair should be broken off; the younger Bierce, who had inherited something of the stubbornness of his father's nature, was resolved that it should not. The two held a long interview behind closed doors, while Sterling awaited outside in trepidation. At last, young Leigh emerged thoroughly shaken. "My father is a greater man than Christ," he sobbed. "He has suffered more than Christ!" Bierce was destined to lose this second son, also. In one of his letters to a friend there is this postscript, poignant in its grief: "It is just a year since Leigh died. I wish I could stop counting the days."

When Collis P. Huntington, of the Central Pacific Railroad, was lobbying in Washington, D. C., in behalf of the interests which were seeking to cancel their obligations to the government, Hearst called Bierce to the nation's capital. A newspaper reporter informed Huntington that the satirist was in town. "How much does he want?" Huntington inquired. Bierce, of course, soon heard of this and replied: "How much? Just seventy-five million dollars; and if I happen to be out of town when the day of payment comes, Mr. Huntington can turn that amount over to the Treasurer of the United States." Subsequently Bierce startled the city by refusing the proffered hand of Huntington. The lobbying campaign failed.

The remaining years of Bierce's residence in America were spent in Washington, with periodic visits to New York, of which place he was enamoured. He was a daily visitor to the Army and Navy Club in Washington, where he was addressed as "Major," a term he had suppressed upon the Pacific Coast because of its military ostentation. He served as the Washington correspondent of the *New York American*, and, at the same time, conducted a column in the *Cosmopolitan* with success; but he continued to be mysteriously unhappy.

In the autumn of 1913 he made a pilgrimage to the Civil War zone of the South. His visit was chivalrously acclaimed by the southern press; and Bierce, with the memories of youth

surging to a freshened consciousness, spoke with such sincere gallantry of the former foe that he endeared himself to all he met.

Before he left Washington he had intimated that he proposed a tour of Mexico and South America, but from his last few letters it is evident that he had quite made up his mind to join Villa and the Constitutionalists. From Washington, under the date of October 1, 1913, he wrote: "Goodbye—if you here of my being stood up against a Mexican stone wall and shot to rags, please know that I think that a pretty good way to depart this life. It beats old age, disease, or falling down the stairs. To be a Gringo in Mexico—ah, that is euthanasia!" A month later from Laredo, Texas, he sent this message: "I shall not be here long enough to hear from you, and don't know where I shall be next. Guess it doesn't matter much." That last remark was a paraphrase of his favorite and final comment upon life: "Nothing matters!"

The death of Ambrose Bierce is more mysterious than that of Shelley, or of Poe. The drowned Shelley was found imbedded in the sands of Lerici; the insensible Poe was picked up in a street in Baltimore; the body of Bierce lies in an unknown grave. It is thought that he was present at the battle of Torreón. Strange rumors have been bruited of his passing. An unidentified Mexican affirmed that he had been present at his execution and claimed to have in his possession a passport of the American which he had taken from the dead man's clothing. The story has been discredited. One wild report had it that he had emerged from Mexico only to go down with Kitchener in the North Sea; another, that he had appeared in Flanders. No one of these rumors can be given credence. But whatever the circumstances,—when the pack of Death turned upon the gaunt Gray Wolf, he went down in a whirl of clean white fangs and flying fur!

During the last years of his residence in America, the collected works of Bierce appeared between the covers of twelve large volumes. When examining this formidable output, it is well to remember that the man throughout the entire period of production was a publicist—a professional satirist earning his livelihood as a columnist for William Randolph Hearst. As an

opinionator, he originated no deathless thoughts; he produced nothing memorable and lasting in criticism. While interesting, and well done in its way, much of his journalism deserved to expire with the day's newspaper. He himself was aware of this, for he wrote to a friend: "My newspaper work is in no sense literature. It is nothing; and only becomes something when I give it the very use to which I would put nothing literary."

Between his newspaper work and his short stories, Bierce drew a sharp and haughty line. The one was done for a livelihood, the other for art. If, in this, the man was a paradox, one may venture the commonplace remark that all men have in them something of the paradox. How often in America does one see the spectacle of a city ward boss indecorous as a public servant, yet exemplary as a private citizen!

Before dismissing the greater portion of Bierce's work as journalistic in gesture, it might be well to examine into it, to better understand the ironic nature of the man, and the chiseled chastity of his style. Bierce was a nihilist in this: he accepted nothing on trust; he held the venerated principles of mankind in slight esteem; he honored few men whom his contemporaries called great. Cynical he was—not the cynicism of the beaver snoozing in the mellow sunlight while his fellows worked on the dam, but the cynicism of the gaunt gray wolf running free of the pack and leaping at the throat of the bull of the herd. Injustice, dishonesty, hypocrisy, and sentimentalism caused the man to see red, and he stalked the offenders down. Once they were down, he had nothing to stand in their stead but men—and it was not for Bierce to reconstruct human nature. He caught the vision of the human race, trapped and betrayed in the wilderness of the world; but, whereas most men have the heart to fight and win, Bierce had the heart to fight and lose. The note of futility pervades his writings.

The style of Bierce is noteworthy for its economy of phrase. No prodigal adjectives, no wayward adverbs, stray into his sentences; no slang assails his prose; no saffron imagery bedaubes his verse. He stripped the language of its embroidered vesture and left it naked in its chastity. His style shows to best advantage in his stories; his philosophy of ironic despair is

evident everywhere; but it is in his essays that Bierce is best revealed as a strange complex of sympathies and antipathies.

Through his essays he voiced his hatred of Socialists, slang, emancipated women, reformers, fat babies, casual introductions, Chicago, prohibitionists, free verse, the new penology, college professors, and cartoons. His aversion to dogs was so great that it would lead one to surmise that he had been bitten by one—or, perhaps, two. And yet, as he wrote his diatribes, a pet lizard perched upon his shoulder, and when he was not writing, he could usually be found riding a bicycle.

He referred to William Dean Howells as that "lousy cat of our letters"; he spoke disparagingly of the "purity and sweetness of character of Mr. Edward Bok"; he lamented that his friend Edwin Markham had addressed "The Man With the Hoe" to "peasant understanding and soured hearts"; he remarked, "Poe, yes; but Whitman never; there isn't a line of poetry in 'Leaves of Grass'"; he called Christopher Columbus a Genoese pirate and a liar, thereby anticipating the Ku Klux Klan by twenty years; of "the curled darlings of the circulating libraries," Mary Wilkins Freeman, Miss Mary Murfree, and Mr. Hamlin Garland, he wrote that he had "long felt it were better if instead of writing things racy of the soil they would till it."

His sympathies were equally pronounced. At a time when Alfred Austin was being ridiculed as Poet Laureate of England, Bierce spoke highly of him; when critics attacked "The Kreutzer Sonata" as immoral, he declared that "in his personal character Tolstoi seems to be the only living Christian, in the sense in which Christ was a Christian"; he eulogized George Sterling as a "great poet—incomparably the greatest that we have on this side of the Atlantic"; he championed Robert Ingersoll; he laboured mightily to bring the stories of Emma Frances Dawson and the poems of Herman Scheffauer before the public.

It is not surprising that he favoured capital punishment for most criminals; the right to suicide; the classical tradition in poetry; preparedness in war; tolerance in religion; and an oligarchic government. He made few concessions to life. Of his own profession he wrote:

It is no "picnic," this business of writing, believe me. Success comes by favour of the gods, yes; but O, the days and nights that you must pass before their altars, prostrate and imploring! They are exacting, the gods—years and years of service you must give in the temple. If you are prepared to do this, go on to your reward. If not, you can not too quickly throw away your pen and— well, marry, for example.

He was impatient of sentimental reform. A true aristocrat, he had a contempt for the mass of men. He positively refused to agonize over the misfortunes of the poor. "The poor," he affirmed, "are always with us, they always were with us, and their state was worse in the times of Homer, Virgil, Shakespeare, Milton and the others than in the days of Morris and Markham." He was even harsh in judgment. "As to harlots, there are not ten in a hundred that are such for any other reason than that they wanted to be. Their exculpatory stories are mostly lies of magnitude."

The acme of his philosophic despair is reached in his best essay, "Natura Benigna":

What a fine world it is, to be sure—a darling little world, "so suited to the needs of man." A globe of liquid fire, straining within a shell relatively no thicker than that of an egg—a shell constantly cracking and in momentary danger of going all to pieces! Three-fourths of this delectable field of human activity are covered with an element in which we can not breathe, and which swallows us by myriads:

With moldering bones the deep is white
From the frozen zones to the tropics bright.

Of the other one-fourth, more than one-half is uninhabitable by reason of climate. On the remaining one-eighth, we pass a comfortless and precarious existence in disputed occupancy with countless ministers of death and pain—pass it in fighting for it, tooth and nail, a hopeless battle in which we are foredoomed to defeat. Everywhere death, terror, lamentation and the laughter that is more terrible than tears—the fury and despair of a race hanging on to life by the tips of its fingers! And the prize for which we strive, "to have and to hold"—what is it? A thing that is neither enjoyed while had, nor missed when lost. So worthless it is, so unsatisfying, so inadequate to purpose, so false to hope and at its best so brief, that for consolation and compensation we set up fantastic faiths of an aftertime in a better world from which no confirming whisper has ever reached us across the void. Heaven is a prophecy uttered by the lips of despair, but Hell is an inference from analogy.

Of such a world, although not a Christian in the commonly accepted meaning of the term, he chose to carry on in the light of Joshua ben Joseph. "This is my ultimate and determinate sense of right," he said, "what, under the circumstances, would Christ have done?—the Christ of the New Testament, not the Christ of the commentators, the priests, and parsons."

Of such a life he voiced a prayer in a farewell letter to a friend: "May you live as long as you want to, and then pass smilingly into the darkness—the good, good darkness . . ."

THE HUMORIST

As an escape from the drab world about him, Bierce sought refuge in the realm of pure nonsense. Much of rollicking humor appeared in *Fun* during his stay in London. It was there that Gladstone one day picked up a book of his, under the pseudonym Dod Grile, *Cobwebs from an Empty Skull*, and complimented his wit and humor—a compliment which was to do much in bringing Bierce to the attention of the British public.

The "Little Johnny" series, which were printed in London, are illustrative of this side of his nature. Little Johnny is a trusting fellow who might easily be the younger original of those amusing cartoons appearing at the present time in the New York *World* by H. T. Webster under the caption, "In the Days When We Believed Everything." He is much interested in the animal kingdom, and his credulity is whetted by the fabrications of his Uncle Ned and his sister's nice young man. He has literary proclivities, too, and composes thirty-three papers upon such beasts and fowl as never existed upon land or sea.

"Rats is radiant," writes the juvenile naturalist, "and the little ones is a mouse, and thats the feller which pursues the women folks up into a high tree and blankets on her blood! But the old he rat eats bread and cheese like a thing of life.

"One day my mother she baited a trap with Dutch cheese, for to catch a rat. My father he looked on a while, and then he said, my father did: 'I guess there isnt any doubt about the rat finding the deadly invention if he follers his nose, and I foresee his finish, but what is the trap for?'"

THE POET

Much of the verse of Ambrose Bierce may be dismissed with the comment that it is not worthy of being retained. His unsheathed pen drew blood; but, as to its immortality, it is writ in water. This is necessarily so because of the ephemeral nature of his subjects: he was concerned with petty men and pettier quarrels. His poetry is preserved in two volumes, *Black Beetles in Amber* and *Shapes of Clay* (as titles delightful vignettes), but that of it which will endure is concerned with nobler themes.

In reference to his poetry, he once wrote to a friend: "You should not condemn me for debasing my poetry with abuse; you should commend me for elevating my abuse with a little poetry—here and there. I am not a poet, but an abuser." This is a sample of his abuse:

TO AN ASPIRANT

What! you are a Senator?—you, Mike de Young?
 Still reeking of the gutter whence you sprung?
 Sir, if all Senators were such as you—
 Their hands so slender and so crimson too
 (Shaped to the pocket for Commercial work,
 For literary, fitted to the dirk)
 So black their hearts, so lily-white their livers,
 The toga's torch would give a man the shivers!

Bierce would often write real verse when he put himself to the task. His poem "Creation" is a bold conception:

God dreamed—the sun sprang flaming into place
 And sailing worlds with many a venturous race.
 He woke—His smile alone illumined space.

"Montefiore" is representative of his incisive irony, both in matter and manner of presentation.

I saw—'t was in a dream, the other night—
 A man whose hair with age was thin and white;
 One hundred years had bettered by his birth,
 And still his step was firm, his eye was bright.
 Before him and about him pressed a crowd.
 Each head in reverence was bared and bowed,
 And Jews and Gentiles in a hundred tongues
 Extolled his deeds and spake his fame aloud.

I joined the throng and, pushing forward, cried,
 "Montefiore!" with the rest, and vied
 In efforts to caress the hand that ne'er
 To want and worth had charity denied.

So closely round him swarmed our shouting clan
 He scarce could breathe, and taking from a pan
 A gleaming coin, he tossed it o'er our heads,
 And in a moment was a lonely man!

THE APHORIST

Bierce strikes a consistently higher note with his aphorisms. In this domain his wit is as cynically American as that of E. W. Howe, or Mark Twain. His "To woman: would that we could fall into her arms without falling into her hands"; and, "In youth the heaven of the poet Wordsworth lies about us; later, the world begins to lie about us,"—are entirely worthy of the two Americans or of the Englishman, Oscar Wilde. For forty years these satiric jewels sparkled in the toad's head of his columns.

In 1906 he gathered between the covers of *The Cynic's Word Book* the best of his aphorisms which had appeared sporadically since 1881 in newspapers, under the title of *The Devil's Dictionary*. The gentler of the titles, he confessed, was a concession to the firm which published the book. *The Cynic's Word Book* had an immense vogue. So popular did it become that a flood of "Cynic" books in imitation deluged the market and the very name caused publishers to throw up their hands in surfeited dismay.

Bierce planned the book in the dictionary manner. Thus seven definitions chosen at random:

- Abstainer, n. A weak person who yields to the temptation of denying himself a pleasure. A total abstainer is one who abstains from everything but abstention and especially from inactivity in the affairs of others.
- Advice, n. The smallest current coin.
- Bacchus, n. A convenient deity invented by the ancients as an excuse for getting drunk.
- Beauty, n. The power by which a woman charms her lover, and terrifies her husband.

- Calamity, n. A more than commonly plain and unmistakable reminder that the affairs of this life are not of our own ordering. Calamities are of two kinds: misfortune to ourselves, and good fortune to others.
- Kilts, n. A costume sometimes worn by Scotsmen in America, and Americans in Scotland.
- Pray, v. To ask that the laws of the universe be annulled in behalf of a single petitioner confessedly unworthy.

THE STORY TELLER

Bierce yields to no man in his stories of war and his tales of atavistic terror. Stephens Crane in his *The Red Badge of Courage*, Zola in his *Debauch*, Tolstoi in his *War and Peace*, paint the veracity of war in feebler colors. In the field of the supernatural, Poe is mad and unlicensed; Bierce is sane and restrained. The one volume entitled *In the Midst of Life: Tales of Soldiers and Civilians*, will insure him a permanent place among American men of letters.

He wrote in a period of rococo romance and the pretty Indiana ending. His stories of stark realism long went unsold in America, but the man was adamant. "I know how to write a story (of 'happy ending' sort) for magazine readers for whom literature is too good," he told an acquaintance, "but I will not do so, so long as stealing is more honorable and interesting." If it is the business of fiction to be more beautiful than life, American publishers were justified in their rejection of Bierce; European editors, however, more tolerant in their conception of the aims of fiction, were not so slow in giving him recognition. Bierce facetiously referred to his stories as "cocks that will not fight"; but when their popularity abroad at last made an American edition profitable, this facetiousness was shown in his Preface to be but a thin disguise:

In reissuing this book, with considerable alterations and additions, it has been thought expedient, for uniformity, to give it the title under which it was published in London and Leipzig. The merely descriptive name of the original American edition (published by the late E. L. G. Steele) is retained as a sub-title in order to prevent misunderstandings by purchasers—if the book be so fortunate as to have any. A. B.

Eleven of the stories of *In the Midst of Life* treat of soldiers. Fate skulks upon the edge of battle with an ironic

leer; Death, gone frothing mad, stalks over crimson fields. Glamour there is, but it is glamour entrapped by circumstance, glamour screaming through the night like a monkey in the toils of a boa. And yet, Bierce begins his stories naturally enough; his characters are entirely sane until they are tricked and betrayed to madness by circumstance. He gives an objective portrait of war—an incident detached from the struggle, whereas Stephen Crane views the conflict subjectively—the tiny bit of the huge battle that the soldier muddles through.

In "Chickamauga" the reeling line of beaten battle passes before the eyes of a little deaf-mute who views it innocently and playfully as a spectacle for his amusement until its backward flight brings him again to his home where he finds only smoldering embers and the shell torn body of his mother. In "A Son of the Gods" a blue-and-gold young officer upon a white horse dashes with such bravado before the concealed positions of the enemy in order to draw their fire to save his troops from needless slaughter that when he goes down his men rush forward impetuously into the very death he died to save them from. In "An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge" a southern spy, in the one illusory moment that he is dropping the length of the rope which snaps his neck, goes through a spectacular escape which takes him through the gates of his plantation into the waiting arms of his wife.

A more detailed examination of one of these stories, "A Horseman of the Sky," will reveal the naturalness with which Bierce handles an unnatural situation. Carter Druse is a young Virginian who has joined a Union regiment. Upon taking leave of his father he is told, "Well, go, sir, and whatever may occur, do what you conceive to be your duty. Virginia, to which you are a traitor, must get on without you." The boy is given a cliff to guard, from which a Confederate spy might easily view the entire strength of the Federal detachment encamped in the valley below. He falls asleep in a clump of bushes, and upon awakening sees the figure of a southern horseman outlined against the sky—an equestrian statue superb in its delineations. He realizes that if the man rides away the plans of the northern army will go with him, so he raises his rifle and fires. Those

in the valley below are startled to see a horseman from the sky descending in full gallop upon them.

After firing his shot, Private Carter Druse reloaded his rifle and resumed his watch. Ten minutes had hardly passed when a Federal sergeant crept cautiously to him on hands and knees. Druse neither turned his head nor looked at him, but lay without motion or sign of recognition.

"Did you fire?" the sergeant whispered.

"Yes."

"At what?"

"A horse. It was standing on yonder rock—pretty far out. You see it is no longer there. It went over the cliff."

The man's face was white, but he showed no other sign of emotion. Having answered, he turned away his eyes and said no more. The sergeant did not understand.

"See here, Druse," he said, after a moments silence, "it's no use making a mystery. I order you to report. Was there anybody on the horse?"

"Yes."

"Well?"

"My father."

The sergeant rose to his feet and walked away. "Good God!" he said.

The eleven tales of civilian life are recitals of atavistic terror—such terror as was felt by the dawn man when he chased the sabre-tooth tiger from his cave with a lighted fire brand and builded a roaring bonfire at the entrance to shut out the darkness of the night; such terror as was felt by Adam and Eve, when, deserted by the sun, they spent their first night upon the earth listening to the cry of the loon and wondering if the light of day was ever to come again.

"The Eyes of the Panther" is representative of this group, although it is not, necessarily, the best. Jenner Brading has just asked Irene Marlowe, who loves him, to be his wife. "I cannot, and will not," she replies. "I am insane." When pressed for an explanation she says that her mother, heavy with child and alone in her forest cabin, had gone mad when she beheld the reddish-green eyes of a panther staring at her through an unopened window. Three months later her child was born. Brading, affected by the story, is brooding one night in his home on the edge of the village where Irene is

staying, when he is alarmed at the eyes of a panther glaring at him through his window. He grabs a revolver and fires. There is a wild, high scream of a wounded beast, human in sound, devilish in suggestion. Rushing from the house he traces a bloody trail into the bushes. He finds the body of his victim. It is not a panther—it is Irene.

The stories of the civilian group, like those of a companion volume, *Can Such Things Be?* are bizarre in plot, yet they are told with the simplicity of a Maupassant—a simplicity of language which enhances their weirdness. He is superior to Poe in this type of story, for Poe dealt with characters who were chronically insane, with strained Gothic situations, with eerie phrases and illusive imagery.

Bierce tried one story of sustained horror, "The Monk and the Hangman's Daughter," in thirty-five thousand words, which takes on the semblance of a novel. It was not entirely the work of Bierce. Some obscurity surrounds its source, and no little dispute was waged as to its authorship, but the explanation as given by Bierce has been accepted as substantially correct. It seems that the foundation of the narrative lies in an old manuscript originally belonging to the Franciscan monastery at Berchtesgaden, Bavaria, which a peasant gave to Herr Richard Voss of Heidelberg; the German version passed into the possession of G. Adolphe Danziger, of San Francisco, who, feeling a lack of craftsmanship, accorded Bierce the franchise to write the story as he wished.

Bierce did a most convincing bit of medieval realism. From the opening sentence unto the last, the shadow of tragic fatalism broods over the story like Mephistopheles over the soul of Faust. The young monk, Ambrosius, catching the first glimpse of the beautiful hangman's daughter, Benedicta, as she frightens the vultures away from the putrid shapes on the gibbet with her round bare arms, is distraught with fear and feels that it is a sure sign that the girl is stepping upon the spot which will one day be his grave. The two are caught in a stream of mistaken circumstance and are swept swiftly on to that moment of unhappy destiny in which Ambrosius comes to believe that he is the especial agent of God to save the body and soul of the

young girl from his dissolute rival, Rochus, the son of the Saltmaster, and plunges a knife into her breast.

The closing paragraph brings the Biercean shock:

To this old manuscript are added the following lines by another hand: "On the fifteenth day of October, in the year of our Lord 1680, in this place, Brother Ambrosius was hanged, and on the following day his body buried under the gallows close to that of the girl Benedicta, whom he killed. This Benedicta, though called the hangman's daughter was (as is now known through the declaration of the youth, Rochus) the bastard child of the Saltmaster by the hangman's wife. It is also veritably attested by the same youth that the maiden cherished a secret and forbidden love for him who slew her in ignorance of her passion. In all else, Brother Ambrose was a faithful servant to the Lord. Pray for him, pray for him!"

Gertrude Atherton upon reading the story, remarked that Bierce had the most brutal imagination that she had ever encountered. The author gracefully accepted this comment as a compliment, and in one of his letters stated: "Gertrude Atherton is sending me picture-postals of Berchtesgaden and other scenes of 'The Monk and the Hangman's Daughter.' She found the places 'exactly as described'—the lakes, the mountains, St. Bartalomae, the cliff-meadow where the edelweis grows, and so forth. The photographs are naturally very interesting to me."

Bierce believed in his literature. It has been a dozen years since he passed into "the good, good darkness," leaving behind as his gift to man, his works in twelve bound volumes. The America of his own day did not judge him kindly. In the field of journalism he will be remembered as a writer of searching intelligence, who wrote without fear or favor. In the domain of fiction he is attaining a renaissance. Who knows? The America of another day may speak of Hawthorne, Melville, Whitman, Poe—and Bierce.

The Burning of Columbia Reconsidered

JAMES D. HILL

Michigan College of Mines

After making President Lincoln a Christmas present of Savannah in 1864, Sherman lingered in the Georgia seaport for almost a month, reorganizing and recuperating his veteran combat units for another campaign of penetration. South Carolina was to be taught that there was a certain amount of truth in the Union commander's much quoted motto. January 18, 1865, found all in readiness, and the following day saw the departure of the last brigade that was to participate in the final mission of destruction.

There followed a twenty-eight day march that was fraught by flooded swamps, swollen rivers, and the ever present Wheeler's cavalry which hovered on the flanks and front, but which always retreated before any Federal formation that resembled a battle array. Though during this period Wheeler's command was combined with that of Butler and placed under the immediate authority of the highly vaunted Wade Hampton, there was no change in tactics. Thus it was that after a slight show of force and a brief cannonade, the advance regiments of the 17th and 15th corps, which constituted Sherman's right wing and were commanded by Major General O. O. Howard, occupied the city of Columbia early in the forenoon of February 17, 1865. The Confederate capitulation without resistance rightfully led the citizens to expect the treatment that is supposed to be accorded noncombatants in civilized warfare—if there is such a thing. Nevertheless, within twenty-four hours three-fifths of the city was in ashes, and practically all of its twenty thousand¹ inhabitants were brought face to face with dire want for food, shelter or both.

¹ Ordinarily the population of Columbia was not more than eight thousand. Because of its thought-to-be exceedingly safe position, however, it had become a rendezvous for the families of many wealthy Southerners, and a depository of "wealth in plate, jewels, pictures, books, manufacturers of art . . . not to be estimated."—Simms, William Gilmore, *The Sack and Destruction of Columbia*, p. 8. The location of the Confederate governmental establishments, such as the Treasury note printing works, arsenal, and quartermaster supply houses, no doubt swelled the population also. But twenty thousand is a liberal estimate.

To the "bummers" of Sherman's army, and to many of its officers, this was just another high light, literally, of a glorious campaign. I am not sure that the generals gave it serious consideration after General Howard's restoration of order the following morning. There is no evidence of even the formality of an investigation found in the Official Records of the campaign. Only one officer, a colonel acting as a brigade commander, wrote an official report discussing the affair within forty-eight hours of its occurrence. A division commander wrote his report of the occupation, five days after the burning of the city. Those in high command, the corps commanders, General Howard and Sherman himself, waited until the following April to commit themselves in official documents.² But no serious indictments can be made against them for this delay, for the army was out of touch with Washington until it reached Goldsboro, North Carolina, late in March. Why write reports that could not be forwarded with safety for another six weeks? is a reasonable as well as logical explanation of this delay.

This lapse of time between the episode and the writing of the reports, together with a dearth of *official* Confederate reports, due no doubt to the necessarily hasty moves of Wheeler and Hampton, is unfortunate from the viewpoint of the historical investigator, because the affair became the subject of a hot controversy during this interval, and so the early April reports of the Federal commanders were written under conscious restraint, and, in at least one case, were even colored for propaganda purposes.³ Nor was the heat of the argument conducive to conservative statements by the Confederates.⁴ The Federal restraint is well illustrated by these two brief passages: "I am satisfied by statements made to me by *respectable citizens* of the town," wrote Brigadier General W. B. Woods in his much too short report of March 26, "that the fire was first set by the negro inhabitants."⁵ One is not surprised to find the brigadier such a conservative man when it is recalled that he

² Note the dates mentioned below in connection with the individual reports.

³ See comments on Sherman's report, below.

⁴ W. G. Simms' series of articles in the Columbia *Phoenix*, a few months after the incident, is a good example of Southern rabidness. They were later grouped together in a pamphlet under the title of *The Sack and Destruction of Columbia*.

⁵ All italics are mine unless otherwise stated.

⁶ *Official Records*, Series I, vol. xlvii; pt. i, p. 252.

later rose to the Supreme Bench of the United States. Nevertheless, for a veteran of four years service to seek the opinions of citizens preparatory to writing his report of military operations, is a novelty in army paper work. Furthermore, one cannot but wonder if this cautious commander saw nothing or formed no opinion of his *own* on that terrific night. He should have. When the flames and rioting were at their height, he was commander of the provost guard in the city!⁷

The second illustrative passage is from the report of that straightforward, professional soldier, Major General Howard. He not only tells a fuller and more complete story of the affair, but he also admits in perfect candor that he has been "particular in narrating these preliminary incidents because there followed one of the most terrific scenes I have ever witnessed, and we are charged by the rebels with its inception."⁸

The charge to which he refers was made by the still retreating General Wade Hampton. It so happened that on February 24, Sherman wrote the Confederate chief of cavalry, complaining that twenty-eight of his foragers had been captured and murdered. He explained that he was about to retaliate by executing a like number of Confederates of the same rank. "I merely assert," he continued, "our war right to forage and my resolve to protect the lives of my foragers to the extent of life for life."⁹

Of course Hampton was vindictive to the superlative degree upon the receipt of such a letter. On the 27th, exactly ten days after the burning of Columbia, he wrote Sherman, disclaiming any knowledge of the murdered foragers. He assured Sherman that fifty-six Federals, with a decided preference for officers in their selection, would be shot as soon as he heard of the execution of the twenty-eight Confederates. He then made against Sherman a bitter counter-charge of barbarous warfare. Of course he cited the Columbia crime in long flowing phrases.¹⁰ Thus we see the controversy was at fever heat be-

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 265.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 198.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pt. ii, p. 546.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 596.

fore any contemporary accounts¹¹ or official documents, other than those that I shall emphasize in this paper, were recorded.

Sherman's response was not to Hampton, but took the form of his official report to the War Department. It was written April 4, and was as follows:

Single

In anticipation of the occupation of the city, I had made written orders to General Howard touching the conduct of the troops. These were to destroy absolutely all arsenals and public property not needed for our own use, as well as all railroads, depots, and machinery useful in war to an enemy, but to spare all dwellings, colleges, schools, asylums, and harmless private property. I was the first to cross the pontoon bridge (across the Broad river), and in company with General Howard, rode into the city. The day was clear, but a perfect tempest of wind was raging. The brigade of Colonel Stone was already in the city, and was properly posted. Citizens and soldiers were on the streets, and general good order prevailed. General Wade Hampton . . . had, in anticipation of our capture of Columbia, ordered that all cotton, public and private, should be moved into the streets and fired, to prevent our making use of it. Bales were piled everywhere, the rope and bagging cut, and tufts of cotton were blown about in the wind, lodged in the trees and against houses, so as to resemble a snow-storm. Some of the piles of cotton were burning, especially one in the very heart of the city, near the court house, but the fire was partially subdued by the labor of our soldiers. During the day, the Fifteenth Corps passed through Columbia and out on the Camden road. The Seventeenth did not enter the town at all; and, as I have before stated, the Left Wing and cavalry did not come within two miles of the town.

Before one single public building had been fired by order, the smouldering fires, set by Hampton's order, were rekindled by the wind, and communicated to the buildings around. About dark they began to spread, and got beyond the control of the brigade on duty within the city. The whole of Woods' division¹² was brought in, but it was found

¹¹ Newspaper reports are still more uncertain. The Columbia *Phoenix* has been mentioned already. The Charleston papers had troubles of their own locality to air, without borrowing those of Columbia. Indeed, the *Mercury*, according to the *National Intelligencer* of February 20, suspended publication on the day Columbia was burned. The evacuation of Charleston about the same time overshadowed, apparently, the Columbia affair in the press of Richmond and the North. Furthermore, the demoralized condition of transportation and communication in the interior, made news very uncertain in periodicals as close as those of Richmond. The *New York Times*, of February 28, quotes the Richmond *Whig* of the 25th, to the effect that a bloody and stubborn battle had been fought for the possession of Columbia. A few days later, the same paper quotes the Richmond *Examiner* of February 28 as saying: "A rumor (which is no doubt exaggerated) has it that three-fourths of the city was destroyed by fire, the origin of which is variously stated. Gen. Hampton is said to have fired his house there himself and to have seen it burn to the ground before he left." The weight of the evidence denies all of this save that the city was burned, and the paper doubted that. Or, perhaps it did not want to believe it.

¹² The division of Maj. Gen. Chas. R. Woods, a brother of the brigadier quoted above.

impossible to check the flames which, by midnight, had become unmanageable, and raged until about 4 a. m. When the wind subsided they were got under control. I was up nearly all night, and saw Generals Howard, Logan, Woods, and others, laboring to save houses and protect families thus suddenly deprived of shelter, and even of bedding and wearing apparel.

I disclaim, on the part of my army, any agency in this fire, but, on the contrary, claim that we saved what of Columbia remains unconsumed. And, without hesitation, I charge General Wade Hampton with having burned his own city of Columbia, not with a malicious intent, or as the manifestation of a silly "Roman stoicism," but from folly and want of sense, in filling it with lint, cotton, and tinder. Our officers, and men on duty, worked well to extinguish the flames; but others not on duty, including the officers who had long been imprisoned there, rescued by us, may have assisted in spreading the fire after it had once begun, and may have indulged in unconcealed joy to see the ruin of the capital of South Carolina.²³

The above report is not chosen for reproduction in full because it is the most reliable of the several reports and sundry other documents that are available. To the contrary, Sherman's report is the most colored and least reliable²⁴ of the several contemporary accounts of the conflagration. It is chosen, however, because it provides as good an outline for expansion by further investigation as any other single account; because from it the reader gets a fuller understanding of the controversy, and because it raises certain questions that facilitate this inquiry.

In consideration of this cloud of doubt over Sherman's report, the first question that is likely to come to one's mind is: Did Sherman actually give the orders he described? This is easily answered. That the Union commander did order exactly what he claims, there can be no doubt. The orders in question

²³ *Official Records*, Series I, vol. xlvii, pt. i, p. 21.

²⁴ Sherman's own words are the best evidence that he did not strive for the exact truth in the writing of his report. They are: "In my official report of this conflagration, I distinctly charged it to General Wade Hampton, and confess I did so pointedly, to shake the faith of his people in him, for he was in my opinion boastful, and professed to be the special champion of South Carolina."—Sherman, W. T., *Personal Memoirs*, vol. ii, p. 287. It is my opinion that Sherman, except for the propaganda against Hampton, drew heavily from General Howard's report. Of course it is impossible to prove this, but the sequence of incidents mentioned is practically the same in both; both contain the simile comparing the cotton to a snow storm; and Howard submitted his report to Sherman's headquarters, April 1. Sherman wrote his, April 4, and forwarded Howard's report to Washington, April 9. For a letter written by Sherman with which Howard's report was forwarded to Washington, see *Official Records*, Series I, vol. xlvii, pt. i, p. 191.

have been published any number of times.¹⁵ General Howard, to whom they were addressed, admits having received them.¹⁶

In 1873 the British-American Mixed Commission for the settlement of war claims indirectly cleared Sherman's name by deciding that the destruction of the city was not an official act of the United States Government, hence it should not be held responsible for the destruction of some English-owned cotton that was lost in the fire.¹⁷ Of course this is enough to silence all charges that the catastrophe was a result of Sherman's orders, but it did not silence those who contended that it was done with his tacit consent. Some writers have supported this opinion by taking from their context certain passages from some correspondence between Sherman and Halleck. December 18, 1864, the latter wrote: "Should you capture Charleston, I hope that by some accident the place may be destroyed; and if a little salt should be sown upon the site, it may prevent the growth of future crops of nullification and secession."¹⁸ Six days later, Sherman replied:

I will bear in mind your hint as to Charleston, and don't think salt will be necessary. When I move, the Fifteenth Corps will be on the Right Wing, and their position will bring them naturally into Charleston first, and if you have watched the history of that corps, you will have remarked that they generally do their work up pretty well. . . . In truth the whole army is burning with an insatiable desire to wreak vengeance upon South Carolina. I almost tremble at her fate, but feel that she deserves all that seems in store for her. . . . I look upon Columbia as quite as bad as Charleston. . . .

This much of the passage is damning beyond a doubt, and is as much as is sometimes quoted. James Ford Rhodes, in the article cited above, though he does not malign Sherman, is guilty of this. The remainder of that very sentence shows that Sherman anticipated the destruction of the public buildings only. It reads: "I doubt if we shall spare the public buildings as we did at Millageville."¹⁹ On the day of occupation, Sherman told Mayor Goodwin, of Columbia, that he would

¹⁵ See Sherman, W. T., *op. cit.*, p. 287. They are also found in the *Official Records*.

¹⁶ See Howard's report cited above.

¹⁷ Rhodes, Jas. F., "Who Burned Columbia?", *Proceedings of the Mass. Hist. Society*, Series II, vol. xv, p. 267.

¹⁸ *Official Records*, Series I, vol. xlv, p. 741.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 799.

find it necessary to destroy certain public buildings, but that he would wait until the wind had subsided sufficiently to render the operation a safe one.²⁰ The weight of the evidence conclusively indicates that Sherman's intentions were well within the usages of modern warfare.

Though Sherman retracted his charges against Hampton, he always insisted that cotton was burning in the streets when he entered the city. He is more emphatic in his *Memoirs* than in the report.²¹ Hampton vigorously denies that any cotton was fired by his order or by the citizens, or was on fire when the Federal troops entered the city,²² but he does not deny that cotton was piled in the streets. These claims were made quite a while after the incident. General Howard supports Sherman's claims. But Generals Logan²³ and C. R. Woods,²⁴ who were right behind Sherman and Howard, had nothing to say concerning cotton. Nor does Colonel Stone, whose brigade was the first to enter the city, and who wrote his report within forty-eight hours of the fire, have a word to say concerning burning cotton in the streets.²⁵ Colonel M. C. Garber, Chief Quartermaster of the Army of Tennessee, who claimed the honor of having ridden into the city with Sherman, and who, by the nature of his work, one would expect to note any burning contraband of war, does not mention cotton.²⁶ Their silence, however, proves nothing. They may have seen it and considered it not worthy of mention. It does seem, however, that if there was enough cotton *on fire* to constitute a *real menace*, especially with a high wind blowing,²⁷ at least one of these other men would have mentioned it. Stone's report is much more detailed than Sherman's; the soldiers extinguishing the fire, whom Sherman and Howard saw, must have been a part of his command. Hence I am of the opinion that Stone would

²⁰ Simms, W. G., *op. cit.*, p. 4.

²¹ Sherman, W. T., *op. cit.*, p. 280.

²² *Congressional Globe*, 1st Sess., 39th Cong., pt. iii, p. 2300.

²³ *Official Records*, Series I, vol. xlvii, pt. i, p. 227. His report was written March 31, 1865.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 243. Woods' report is dated Feb. 21. It is the only one written by a general officer before Hampton started the controversy.

²⁵ *Official Records*, Series I, vol. xlvii, pt. i, p. 264-5.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, vol. liii, p. 53.

²⁷ The existence of the high wind is the one point on which all authorities agree.

have been sure to have mentioned it, had it been more than trivial.

At the same time, I am quite sure that there was some cotton burned in Columbia before Sherman's entry, and that he and Howard saw it, but I do not believe that it was as serious as they represented it to be. Simms, who certainly would not go out of his way to support any testimony of Sherman's, writing in the same year as the disaster, says: "At about 12 o'clock, the jail was discovered to be on fire from within. This building was immediately in the rear of the Market, or City Hall, and in a densely built portion of the city. The supposition is that it was fired by some of the prisoners—all of whom were released and subsequently followed the army. The fire of the jail had been preceded by that of some cotton piled in the streets. Both fires were soon subdued by the firemen."²⁸

The report of Major N. R. Chambliss, of the Confederate Ordnance Department, also testifies as to fires in Columbia, even before the entry of the Federals. On February 20, he wrote: "In the meantime the city was in the wildest terror. The army had been withdrawn (3 a. m.). The straggling cavalry and rabble were stripping the warehouses and railroad depots, and the city was illuminated with *burning cotton*."²⁹ This not only gives additional support to Sherman's claims with regard to burning cotton in the streets, but also reacts against the sincere assertions of Hampton that he burned no cotton prior to his evacuation. Then who was responsible for these first minor fires? It is impossible to place the blame on a single pair of shoulders. One of Hampton's junior officers may have acted without orders; but the fires prior to the Federal occupation were more than likely a natural result of the disorders that accompany any hasty military evacuation under pressure of an advancing and victorious enemy. Most of the Confederate sources, like the one quoted above, readily admit that the rioting and plundering in Columbia, just before the arrival of the Federals, were disgraceful.³⁰

²⁸ Simms, W. G., *op. cit.*, p. 14.

²⁹ *Official Records*, Series I, vol. liii, p. 1050.

³⁰ See Simms, W. G., *op. cit.*, p. 10-12; *Official Records*, Series I, vol. xlv, (Quoting the *Richmond Whig* of February 20, 1865) p. 599; also Dodson, W. C., *Wheeler and His Cavalry* (Quoting the official report of Col. E. E. Portlock, C. S. A., April, 1865), p. 428.

In spite of these disorders, however, it must be admitted that the Confederates did leave the town without doing it material harm. As we have observed, there were two trivial fires within the first ten or twelve hours of the Federal occupation; however, neither of these was after one o'clock. From that time till about 7:00 p. m., in spite of the high wind, there is no authentic record of the city being threatened with destruction by fire. Yet shortly after nightfall there was a general conflagration. Sherman's explanation is within the realm of possibility, but that is all. It certainly is not probable. The true explanation lies in the conduct of Sherman's troops after dark.

But first, let us mark the initiation and progress of the flames. For want of a better source, I must quote from Mr. Simms' rabid account of the episode. Overdrawn though it no doubt is, we shall see that it is partially supported by the reports of some of the more conscientious of the Union commanders.

Among the first fires at evening was one about dark, which broke out in the filthy purlieu of low houses, of wood, on Gervais street, occupied mostly as brothels. Almost at the same time, a body of soldiers scattered over the Eastern outskirts of the city, fired severally the dwellings of Mr. Secretary Trenholm, General Wade Hampton, Dr. John Wallace, J. U. Adams, Mrs. Starke, Mr. Latts, Mrs. English, and many others. There were then some twenty fires in full blast, in as many different quarters, and while the alarm sounded from these quarters, a similar alarm was sent up almost simultaneously from Cotton Town, the Northernmost limit of the city, and from Main street in its very center, at the several stores or houses of O. Z. Bates, C. D. Eberhardt . . . thus enveloping in flames almost every section of the devoted city.¹¹

That the city should become so completely fired without orders from some source, seems improbable; but it is now time to consider the conduct of the Federal troops. Therein some light may be thrown upon the matter.

In his official report of March 31, 1865, Major General Jno. A. Logan, commander of the Fifteenth Corps, wrote:

" . . . the citizens had received our soldiers with bucketfuls of liquor, and the negroes, overjoyed at our entrance, piloted them to buildings where wine and whiskey were stored, and for awhile *all control* was lost over the disorganized mass. . . . Toward dark, Col. Stone's

¹¹ Simms, W. G., *op. cit.*, p. 17.

brigade was released from duty, and fresh troops moved into the city to clear it of the rioters, and if possible to preserve order during the night, but the citizens had so crazed our men with liquor, that it was almost impossible to control them. The scenes that night in Columbia were terrible. Some fiend first applied the torch, and the wild flames leaped from house to house and street to street, until the lower and business part of the city was wrapped in flames. Frightened citizens rushed in every direction, and the *reeling incendiaries dashed*, torch in hand, from street to street, spreading dismay wherever they went."³²

I cannot say that the above picture is much milder than that drawn by Simms.

General Howard, writing a day later than Logan, thought ". . . it is these men [prisoners, army followers, and drunken soldiers]³³ that, I presume, set new fires farther and farther to windward in the northern part of the city".³⁴ Major General Charles R. Woods, commander of the Second Division, Fifteenth Corps, and the only high ranking officer who wrote his report before General Hampton precipitated the controversy, expresses practically the same view in almost as few words.³⁵

Colonel Stone's report, though written immediately after the disaster, is colored to some extent by its defensive tone. It will be recalled that it was his command that had to be "released from duty" because of its inability to maintain order in the city. As to the conduct of the troops and the beginnings of the fire, he wrote:

I was absent from the brigade about an hour in placing the flag on the state-house, and when I rejoined my command found a great number of men drunk. It was discovered that this was caused by hundreds of negroes who swarmed the streets on the approach of the troops and gave them all kinds of liquors from buckets, bottles, demijohns &c. The men had slept none the night before and but little the night before that, and many of them had no supper the night before, and none the breakfast that morning, hence the speedy effect. I forthwith ordered all liquor destroyed, and saw fifteen barrels destroyed within five minutes after the order had been given.

Brevet Major General Woods now sent me word to guard the private property of the citizens and take possession of all public build-

³² *Official Records*, Series I, vol. xlvii, pt. i, p. 227.

³³ The terms are his own.

³⁴ *Official Records*, Series I, vol. xlvii, pt. i, p. 198.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 243.

ings. I did so immediately. . . . A number of buildings were fired during the early part of the evening, but the fire was promptly put out before it had gained much headway. A great many drunken men were now showing themselves in the streets from, I should think, every regiment of our corps, the Seventeenth, and some even from Kilpatricks Cavalry. My command was so scattered throughout the city, I found it necessary to have stronger guard, and therefore applied . . . to Brevet Major General Woods twice, once in writing, for one or two more regiments for patrolling the city, but received no re-enforcements. About 8 o'clock the city was fired in a number of places by some of our escaped prisoners and citizens (I am sure I can prove this), and as some of the fire originated in basements stored full of cotton, it was impossible to extinguish it. The fire engines were ordered out, but the flames could not be stopped; the buildings were old, nearly all wooden ones, and the wind blowing almost a gale. At 8 p. m. I received orders that I was relieved by Brevet Brig. Gen. Woods, and I sent the brigade to camp about one mile out of town, but remained in the city myself, working all night to assist in extinguishing the fire.⁸⁶

Here we find but little that does not appear in the reports of Sherman, Howard, Woods and Logan. He does, however, place all the liquor distribution blame on the negroes instead of partially on the citizens, as did some of the others. Perhaps the most significant passage is that relative to the intoxicated men from the many different regiments of the Fifteenth, Seventeenth and Kilpatrick's Corps. Most of these regiments were encamped outside the city.⁸⁷ This leads one to the natural opinion that Sherman's classification of "others not on duty" included a rather large element of the Federal soldiers in the city that night.

It is interesting to note the assurance of most of the Federal commanders in putting the blame on prisoners released upon the entry of the army. This is obviously done to remove the responsibility as much as possible from the Federal troops. Their inference, of course, is that these initiated the fire which the high wind rendered impossible to control. Even so, they were not offering an acceptable excuse.

There were two classes of prisoners: those in the city jail, guilty of sundry crimes against the city and state; and those Federal officers who had been captured in various campaigns

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 265.

⁸⁷ See the itinerary of Sherman's Right Wing in the *Official Records*, Series I, vol. xlvii, pt. i, p. 76-104.

and confined in the Asylum. The former class had no business being out of jail, even though the Federal army was occupying the city. Major General Woods described them in his report as being "those villians that had that day been *improperly* freed from their confinement in the town prison."³⁸ And to say that the inmates, necessarily few in number, of this town jail could stage such an affair, in the face of a brigade of soldiers on provost guard, certainly is not a compliment to the soldiers.

The Federal officers released from the Asylum, who General Sherman thought, "may have assisted [those not on duty] in spreading the fire," could not have been as decisive an element in the conflagration as the reports would lead one to believe. In these official accounts the "buck" was passed to these officer prisoners-of-war because they, victims of a long, odious imprisonment, would be more readily excused by an investigating commission, public opinion, and posterity, for such conduct. The question is: Were there enough of these released officers to constitute a major factor in such a riot?

A few days before the Confederate evacuation, there were 1,200 Federal army officers imprisoned in the Asylum, according to a letter of February 12 from Colonel Forno, C. S. A., to General Beauregard.³⁹ Certainly enough men to constitute a serious problem, if suddenly freed under such conditions as those that existed in Columbia on February 17. But on February 16, Captain Stewart, C. S. A., arrived in Charlotte, N. C. with 500 of them.⁴⁰ The next morning, Major Griswold arrived with what he thought to be the remainder. Being ill that morning, he asked Captain Stewart to take charge of this detachment also. ". . . I went to the cars," wrote that officer to Colonel Forno, "and I missed quite a number of prisoners I had left at Columbia."⁴¹ On inquiry, I learned that they had made their escape at Columbia the night before Major Griswold left, by secreting themselves in the roof of the building."⁴²

³⁸ *Official Records*, Series I, vol. xivii, pt. i, p. 243.

³⁹ *Official Records*, Series II, vol. viii, p. 213.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 443.

⁴¹ Captain Stewart had been in direct charge of the officers' prison at Columbia, and would naturally note the absence of a number of men more quickly than Major Griswold.

⁴² *Official Records*, Series II, vol. viii, p. 443.

This could not have been a very large number. Hence the officer-prisoners' role in the tragedy becomes almost as unimportant, if not as much so, as that of the civilian jail inmates.

To what extent the high wind was to blame for the disaster is one of the imponderables of the situation, and can only be approximated. If it put the flames hopelessly beyond the most strenuous and sincere efforts of the Federals, it was a major factor; if not, it was a minor factor. All the reports by the Federal officers tell of vigorous efforts of their own or their men to stop the flames. Simms readily admits that Sherman and other high ranking officers quickly appeared in the streets and did what they could to save the town.⁴³ But the ability of a colonel or a general to fight fire is no more than that of an ordinary soldier, if his men do not effectively carry out his orders. And their combined efforts may be quickly nullified by "reeling incendiaries." One readily notes that Sherman restricted the officers and men who "worked well to extinguish the flames" to those *on duty*. Major General C. R. Woods complained that the city "was filled with both citizens and soldiers who were in noways disposed to have the scene closed."⁴⁴ Sherman's letter to Halleck indicates that the feelings of the rank and file of the Federal troops toward the South Carolinians, whom they believed to be responsible for the war,⁴⁵ were not conducive to their exerting their best efforts in saving the town. Lieutenant Colonel Charles H. Jackson, commanding the 18th Wisconsin, wrote in his diary that he was in Columbia the morning following the disaster. He was of the opinion that the brigade on duty "made some efforts to put out the fires, but I do not think you could have got enough men in the army disposed to stop it to have affected anything."⁴⁶ These things, together with the fact that the two fires during the day—when the wind was just as strong, but when the town was not full of drunken, off-duty soldiers and stragglers—were very readily curbed, lead me to the opinion that the high wind was a minor factor.

⁴³ Simms, W. G., *op. cit.*, p. 17.

⁴⁴ *Official Records*, Series I, vol. xlvii, pt. i, p. 243.

⁴⁵ See page 8.

⁴⁶ Channing, Edward, *A History of the United States*. (Quoting Jackson, *The Colonel's Diary*) vol. 6, p. 580.

In the light of these facts, we are warranted in making these conclusions regarding the burning of Columbia.

It is *highly improbable* that the Confederate fires before the evacuation had anything to do with the destruction of the city. Sherman did not order the burning of the city or officially desire that it should be done. But the soldiers of his right wing, grasping the opportunity for a relaxation from the rigors of military discipline and the long, wet, winter march, burned the city on their own initiative.⁴⁷ While they did it, their sober comrades, no doubt in many cases regretting that they were on duty, as it deprived them of a part in the revelry, made formal gestures at saving the town.⁴⁸

Whitelaw Reid, in a rather eulogistic work published as early as 1868, characterized the burning of Columbia as "the most monstrous barbarity of the barbarous march".⁴⁹ He also criticizes Sherman rather severely for not ferreting out and punishing the offending parties. "He did not make his army understand that he regarded this barbarity as a crime."⁵⁰ I hesitate to deal so harshly with Sherman. In the heart of a hostile country, with all communications cut and with opposing armies forming into a unit on his front, is not the time or place for even an idolized commander to be giving his men object lessons. This does not, however, make less true Mr. Reid's characterization of the episode as a "monstrous barbarity."

⁴⁷ In spite of all that Sherman wrote and said after the war in trying to exonerate himself and his army, he never did talk himself into believing that his men did not commit the crime. In his *Memoirs*, immediately after disclaiming for himself and his command any blame for the affair, he resumes the narrative with the continued advance of his troops. In so doing he unconsciously lapsed into the truth. He wrote: "Having utterly ruined Columbia, the right wing began its march northward. . . ."—Sherman, W. T., *op. cit.*, p. 288.

⁴⁸ Simms' *Sack and Destruction* . . . bristles with instances of guards, posted to preserve private property, joining the drunk and pilfering men in the spoilation of the town, especially when the fire reached the property they were supposed to be guarding. Stone's complaint of drunkenness in his brigade while on provost guard duty, gives credence to Simms' charges.

⁴⁹ Reid, *Whitelaw, Ohio in the War*, p. 475.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 476.

Chaucer and Oral Reading

GEORGE P. WILSON

Guilford College

The purpose of this paper is to lay down some general principles and to discuss certain facts relating to these principles which will tend to establish the probability that Chaucer wrote some of his works with the intention of reading them aloud. Such methods as I shall pursue will be followed merely because I regard the question a difficult one to settle, one whose direct and actual evidence is of a circumstantial nature. That is to say, we have no contemporary of Chaucer's who says that Chaucer read his works aloud, as we do in the case of certain Greek, Latin, and French writers. Hence I shall go back to the times of ancient Greece and Medieval France for environment and conditions that are in many respects strikingly similar to those of fourteenth century England. I shall attempt to show that the Greeks, the French, and the English at certain periods made greater use of oral reading than we commonly think. Especially do I hope to lend some plausibility to the theory that Chaucer read his poetry aloud. Not only will this conclusion be inferred from the conditions of Chaucer's time, but also from internal evidence in his works.

An author's verbal composition presupposes two parties concerned: the author and his public. In addition, he must have a medium of expression. I shall speak here only of those compositions which have, on the part of the author, some conscious intention of unity and some marks of the artist. I do not refer to court proclamations, legal notices, and business transactions, but to such units as songs, poems, romances, tales, legends, histories, and so on,—in short, to what we now commonly designate as literature.

From primitive times down to the nineteenth century, composers of verbal compositions have had only two great media for expressing their thoughts: oral speech and writing. Arising out of these two media have resulted three different stages through which verbal composition passes in going from its

author to the public. The first stage is transmission by means of *singing* or *reciting*. This was the one and only method before writing came into existence. It is the primitive form of communication. The songs and poems composed were held in memory and handed down from generation to generation by word of mouth. It is said that the ancient Sanskrit Vedas were thus preserved for many generations before they were finally written out. The oldest Vedas are songs or chants, whose rhythm would cause them to be remembered easily.¹

The second stage is transmission by *reading aloud*. This period must, quite naturally, come after men have learned the art of writing; it runs along parallel with the third period, that of *silent reading*. In fact, all three of these methods of communication continued after the invention of writing. In a few instances, even today, there exist in uneducated communities something of the first and a great deal of the second.

Since we are concerned only with the first two stages, I shall discuss these in reference to Greek, French, and English Literature.

Most classical authorities believe that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and other early Greek poems, were not at first written out, since there was, at the time of their composition, probably no form of writing in use.² Putnam summarizes the case in the following words:

. . . it is certain that Greek literature between the ninth century and the sixth century B. C. cannot have been prepared for a reading public. The epics which have come down to posterity from that period must have been transmitted by word of mouth and memory. Mahaffy and Jevons are in accord in pointing out that the effort of memory required for the composition and transmission of long poems without the aid of writing, while employing a power never manifested among a people possessing printed books, is not in itself at all incredible. Memory was equal to the task, and the earlier Greek poems, memorized by the authors as they were composed, were preserved by successive generations of bards. They were also composed with special reference to the requirements of the reciters whose recitations in the earlier periods were usually given at banquets of the royal courts or great houses to which the bards were attached.³

¹ Mason, W. A., *A History of the Art of Writing*, p. 19.

² Jevons, F. B., *A History of Greek Literature*, p. 49; *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, article on Homer.

³ Putnam, Geo. H., *Authors and their Public in Ancient Times*, p. 63.

More value was placed on a good memory in ancient times than in the modern times of printed books and memory aids. Niceratus, in Xenophon's *Banquet*, says that he was compelled by his father to memorize all the poetry of Homer, and that he was able to repeat orally the entire *Iliad* or *Odyssey*.⁴

Jevons holds that writing was known in Greece as early as 700 B. C.; that by the sixth and fifth centuries it was pretty widely used by authors, for this was the time when prose literature began. But, says he ". . . the rise of prose literature does not necessitate the assumption of a reading public, but only an audience to listen to the author read his manuscript." By 450 B. C. there was a reading public, as is shown by the fact that a book trade existed.⁵

We have evidence which would lead us to believe that there existed in Greece what I term the *oral reading stage*. Here are a few occasions, or conditions, when the Greeks made use of oral reading:

1. Works were read aloud at festivals and public gatherings. Herodotus read his works in Athens at the festival of Panathenea. Geogias, Hippias, Empedocles, Herodotus, and others read at Olympia.⁶ Lucian tells of how the Cynic, Demetrius, once snatched *The Bacchantes* of Euripides from the hands of a bungling public reader because the latter was "murdering" the author, as he expressed it.⁷ At these public gatherings, an elevated seat was usually provided for the reader. If the auditors were highly pleased with the reading, they bore the reader to his house.⁸

2. Sometimes, professional readers read aloud for the cultured class at meals or the baths.⁹

3. The Greeks read to groups of friends or pupils for the purpose of intellectual entertainment. Plato read his *Phaedo* to friends and pupils. Protagoras read his treatise on the

⁴ Xenophon, *The Banquet of Philosophers*, III, 5.

⁵ Jevons, F. B., *A History of Greek Literature*, p. 48.

⁶ Jevons, F. B., *A History of Greek Literature*, p. 48; Eschenburg, *Manual of Classical Literature*, p. 337.

⁷ Putnam, Geo. H., *Authors and their Public in Ancient Times*, p. 100.

⁸ Eschenburg, *Manual of Classical Literature*, p. 337.

⁹ *Ibid.*

gods, in the home of Euripides, as well as in the Lyceum. Socrates heard Zeno read his works.¹⁰

4. Sometimes, works were read to friends for their criticism. Isocrates gave as his reason for not wishing to publish one of his books, *The Panathenaicus*, that he read it to a group of friends who did not agree with its conclusions.¹¹

5. Books were read aloud to advertise them. The author might read aloud his book, or the bookseller might read aloud from the manuscripts in his shop, which was frequented by men of literary tastes.¹² Diogenes Laërtius relates that when the shipwrecked Zeno was wandering about the streets of Athens, he chanced to pass a bookseller's shop, where he heard the owner reading Xenophon's *Memoirs*.¹³

There were among the Greeks two general factors that caused oral reading to be so prevalent: first, the scarcity of writing materials and the difficulty and expense of writing; and, second, the fact that the Greeks had so long been accustomed to receiving their poetry, their history, and their philosophy through the ear rather than the eye.

When we come to examine Medieval French Literature, we discover that it went through its first and second stages in much the same way that Greek Literature did. The French Literature is of more importance to our consideration than the Greek, because of its geographical and chronological nearness to English Literature, and of the close kinship and parallel development between the two.

The first stage of French Literature need not occupy our attention long. Gaston Paris and other students believe that the first poems, songs, and romances were composed and handed down orally. During the Roman days in France, the French people were accustomed to acting, to reciting verses, and to telling tales at festivals. When the public festival disappeared, the actors and reciters continued their trade.¹⁴ During the Carolingian times minstrels were attached to lords or hired by

¹⁰ Jevons, F. B., *A History of Greek Literature*, p. 48.

¹¹ Putnam, Geo. H., *Authors and their Public in Ancient Times*, p. 110; Rawlings, Gertrude B., *The Story of Books*, p. 27.

¹² Rawlings, Gertrude B., *The Story of Books*, p. 27.

¹³ Putnam, Geo. H., *Authors and their Public in Ancient Times*, p. 113.

¹⁴ Paris, Gaston, *Modern French Literature*, p. 18.

them. Some traveled about the country singing or reciting at castles. As yet, the poems and songs were not written down.¹⁵ Paris says: "In French we have no manuscripts of our oldest *chansons de geste* anterior to the thirteenth century, and naturally they are presented by these manuscripts in a very modernized form."¹⁶ This critic is also of the opinion that many of these early poets, especially the troubadours, could not have written out their works, as they were uneducated.¹⁷ The singing or reciting was doubtless accompanied by some sort of musical instrument, just as in the early days of the Hebraic and Germanic peoples. Lacroix thinks that later on prose romances were simply read or narrated without music.¹⁸

In making such classifications as I have made, one must not be too dogmatic, too precise. One cannot say that the oral-reading or the silent-reading stage first began in a given year or decade, or that the second stage completely overshadowed and replaced the first stage. We can be pretty sure about some matters concerning the first period. We can say of the second period that during certain centuries, and among certain people, oral reading was very much practiced, and that some authors probably intended their works for oral reading rather than for silent reading.

Paris considers that in the twelfth century French Literature came to be transmitted less orally, but was written down and read aloud. The *chansons de geste* were evidently intended to be sung; the early romances to be recited; and lyric poems to be sung to the person addressed. However, he says, ". . . the oldest prose narratives were written or dictated by the author, but from this narrative, they were to be read aloud to those who wished to hear them."¹⁹ In other words, we may say that about the time when writing came into more common use, and when the *chansons de geste* were gradually replaced by romances, people began to have read to them romances or other literary productions, or read them aloud themselves. (I

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 34.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

¹⁸ Lacroix, Paul, *Science and Literature in the Middle Ages*, p. 366.

¹⁹ Paris, Gaston, *Medieval French Literature*, pp. 9, 35, 78; Mott, *A System of Courtly Love*, p. 23; Nitzze, *Romania*, vol. 44, p. 14.

do not mean to say that these things were never read silently.) Fortunately there is preserved for us in one of those short contemporary biographical accounts appended to the works of the troubadours, a statement that indicates that the troubadour lived in a time when he was expected to be able to sing and to read aloud. The statement is: "Arnautz [de Marueilh] both sang and read romances well."²⁰

Oral reading among all classes was doubtless the common practice. It appears to have been the custom with the nobility as far back as the eighth century. Charlemagne had historical and religious works read at his meals. He delighted to have read to him the deeds of kings, and the writings of St. Augustine, especially the *De Civitate*.²¹ Deschamps tells us in his *Autre Balade* of being commissioned by Machaut to deliver a poem of the latter, his *Voir Dit*, to the Count of Flanders, and of his reading aloud the poem to the Count.²² Froissart proudly relates to us, in two of his works, that he read aloud during the evenings his long romance *Le Meliador* to the Count of Foix, at whose castle the poet was being sumptuously entertained for twelve weeks.²³

Chrétien de Troyes furnishes us with another scene in his romance, *Ivain*, or *Chevalier au Lion*, in which he depicts Ivain, coming upon a rich lord under a tree, "who reclined on a silken cloth, and at his side a maiden, who was reading aloud a romance" to her father and mother.²⁴

Some critics think that many romances were composed for the nobility, for a particular lady or lord. A noble person might suggest to the poet the subject or ideas for his poem. Chrétien de Troyes credits Marie d'Aquitaine with having suggested the "matiere" and "sens" of his *Lancelot*.²⁵

In addition to romances and other literature being read to the nobility, we may well believe that the poorer French peo-

²⁰ Mahn, C. A. F., *Die Werke der Troubadours*, vol. 1, p. 147.

²¹ Putnam, Geo. H., *Books and their Makers in the Middle Ages*, p. 69; Maitland, S. R., *The Dark Ages*, p. 357; Lacroix, Paul, *Manners and Customs during the Middle Ages*, p. 63.

²² *Société des Anciens Textes Français*, vol. 1, p. 248.

²³ *Le Dit dou Florin*, II. 286-314; *Chroniques Oeuvres de Froissart*, vol. 11, (Lettenhove ed.)

²⁴ *Ivain*, II. 5360-79.

²⁵ *Histoire Littéraire de la France*, vol. 30, p. 17.

ple also shared this form of entertainment when they could prevail upon some person to read to them. Noël du Fail (c. 1525-1585) describes a sixteenth century gathering which he witnessed in the country on a holiday. Some of the rustics were shooting with bows and arrows, some were jumping, some wrestling, some running races, and so on. At length du Fail's attention was drawn to a man who had a book under his arm. Du Fail enquired of a peasant who this man was. "Ah," the reply was, "that is Roger Bon Temps, a merry careless fellow, who up to the age of fifty kept a parish school; but changing his first trade, he became a wine grower. However, he cannot resist the feast days, when he brings out his old books, and reads to us as long as we choose, such works as *Calendrier des Bergers*, *Fables d'Esope*, *Le Roman de la Rose*, *Matheolus*, *Alain Chartier*, *Crétiën*, *Les Vigiles du feu Roy Charles*, *Les deux Grebins*, and others,"²⁶ If this picture was true of the sixteenth century, it was probably equally as true of the fourteenth century.

Space will not allow me to assign all the circumstances which led to oral reading in France; yet I must touch on two prominent ones in passing. First, many of the great lords and ladies were uneducated, or at least not learned enough to read with sufficient rapidity to justify their attempt at silent reading, and especially when they with little expense and greatly increased pleasure might have some one else read to them. What distinguished the aristocratic class from the lower class was their power, wealth, manners, and war-like occupation,—and not their education. Clerks of the twelfth century read translations of the Latin poets, historians, philosophers, and scientists to the lords and ladies, who were ignorant not only of Latin but of the alphabet. But some of the laity of the thirteenth century were able to read aloud for themselves and others.²⁷ A second cause for this frequent oral reading is to be attributed to the fact that the French people had become accustomed to the performance of minstrels. But in the latter part of the thirteenth century, these acting singers fell into disrepute. The jongleurs were driven to the frontiers of France. Bologna

²⁶ Fail, Noël du, *Rustiques et Facieux, Oeuvre Facétieuses*, vol. 1, p. 11.

²⁷ Paris, Gaston, *Medieval French Literature*, pp. 9, 11, 78.

passed a law against their singing in public places. Some who were able to write gained a sort of patronage from the rich.²⁸ Since the people had been accustomed to being entertained orally, and since these entertainers had been suppressed, the nobility naturally sought some method of entertainment akin to the old form. Hence oral reading became more widespread. We should bear in mind also that books were still costly.

I now come to a consideration of the question in England. The singing or recitative stage among the early English people is such a well established fact that I hardly need supply evidence to that effect. The minstrel appears to have been an indispensable and almost sole entertainer among the early English people and their ancestors, whether in the times of Beowulf, or of St. Aldhelm of Salisbury (709), or of St. Dunstan of Canterbury,²⁹ or of Bishop Robert Grostest of Lincoln,³⁰ or of Taillefer at the battle of Hastings.³¹ Sir Walter Scott thinks that many Scottish minstrels were unable to read or write, that they carried in memory their tremendous store of poems.³² Miss Billings believes that we have no means of determining when romances were first put into writing among the English, but she thinks it was in the first part of the thirteenth century.³³

There is much evidence of the widespread practice of oral reading in Medieval England. I cite some of the conditions under which oral reading occurred.

One method of publishing books in medieval times (in both England and France) was to have them read aloud, three days, before the head of a university, or before some other judge. If the censor approved the book, it was allowed to be transcribed or reproduced. Large universities like Oxford and Paris secured books for their students in this manner.³⁴

Reading aloud was a common and necessary practice with the clergy. Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz, writing in his *De Institutione Clericorum*, 819, lays it down as a

²⁸ Laun, Henry van, *A History of French Literature*, vol. 1, p. 88.

²⁹ Schofield, W. H., *English Literature from the Norman Conquest to Chaucer*, p. 16.

³⁰ Mannyng, Robert, *Handlyng Synne*, 4739-74.

³¹ Paris, Gaston, *Medieval French literature*, p. 43.

³² Scott, Sir W., *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, p. 17.

³³ Billings, Anna H., *A Guide to the Middle English Metrical Romances*, p. ix.

³⁴ Rawlings, Gertrude, *The Story of Books*, p. 51.

prime requisite for clerks who present themselves for examination for holy orders, that they be not only able to read aloud, but be able to read well ("bene"). The archbishop goes into details as to what qualities a clerk must possess, or cultivate, in order to be a good reader: emphasis is laid on the reader's wide learning, his ability to understand the grammatical construction of a sentence, his facility in clear enunciation and pronunciation, his ease and naturalness, cultivation of the voice. Other matters are mentioned which indicate that the archbishop understood the importance of good reading. It is evident that this demand on the clergy for excellence in reading was not an exaction of one particular age, for practically the same directions had been given by Isidore of Seville (c. 560-636) more than two hundred years before Rabanus. And, further, Ivo, Bishop of Chartres (c. 1040-1116), in his *De Rebus Ecclesiasticis*, three hundred years after Rabanus, demanded similar qualifications of his clergy.³⁵

Monks, in addition, were accustomed to reading aloud in monasteries, for their own pleasure or edification.³⁶ It is of interest, also, to note that books were copied or reproduced in monasteries by having one monk read very slowly to a number of scribes who copied. Sometimes as many as twenty scribes copied at one time.

It appears to have been the practice of the clergy to read aloud at meals. The second Council of Rheims (813), in the 17th canon commanded: "That bishops and abbots shall not allow buffooneries to be acted in their presence, but shall have the poor and needy at their tables, and that sacred readings shall be heard there." Likewise the Council of Pavia (850) sets down in its canon a parallel order: "At his table . . . let the stranger, the poor, the infirm, be there, who blessing Christ, may receive blessing from the sacerdotal table. Let there be sacred reading."³⁷

Reading at meals seems to have been the custom with laymen, as well as with the clergy. Abbo, a layman, had por-

³⁵ Maitland, S. R., *The Dark Ages*, p. 43.

³⁶ Putnam, Geo. H., *Books and their Makers*, p. 69.

³⁷ Maitland, S. R., *The Dark Ages*, p. 358.

tions of the Scriptures read aloud at his table.³⁸ I have mentioned previously that this was a practice with Charlemagne.

The better class of people read aloud, or had read to them, romances, tales, etc. John Barbour, a contemporary of Chaucer, is no doubt reflecting fourteenth century custom when he recounts how the Scotch King Bruce, while crossing Loch Lomond in a boat with a few of his men, cheered their spirits by reading to them the romance of *Fierbras*, or *Ferumbras*, a French tale.³⁹ *The Romance of Partenay*, written in Chaucer's time and later translated into English, both in prose and verse, gives strong evidence that the composer expected his work to be read aloud. In the prologue of the verse form the author, Jean d'Arras, has the Duke of Berri tell why he commanded the writer to cast his story in verse:

"Ye shall put in ryme thys historie fre:
I will it be rymed hole entire,
The sonner peple wyll it say or hire."⁴⁰

The English prose translation is even more explicit in stating that the author had the hearer in mind:

And I, as of herte dyligent, of pouere, witt and connyng, [do] as nygh as I can the pure trouth of hys gracyous commandement . . . which this present hystorye I byganne the Wensday [before] saynt Clementis day, in wynter, the yer of our lord mcccclxxxvii; beseeching all them that shalle rede or here Redde that they will pardonne me my fawte yf their be eny⁴¹

Robert Mannyng testifies that the common people were accustomed to being read to:

T' at may be wely on englyssh tolde,
To telle yow that, y may be bolde;
For lewde men y undyrtoke
On englyssh tunge to make thys boke.
For many ben of swyche manere,
That talys and rymys wyl bethly here;
Yn gamys, festys, & at ale,
Love men to lestene to trotéuale:
That may falle ofte to vylanye,

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 319.

³⁹ Barbour, John, *Bruce*, pp. 435-9, 463-6.

⁴⁰ *The Romance of Partenay*, Prologue, 152-4 (E.E.T.S.).

⁴¹ *Romance of Partenay*, prose translation (E.E.T.S., p. ix).

To dedly synne, or other folye;
 For swyche men have y made this ryme
 That they may weyl dyspende here tyme,
 And there-yn sumwhat for to here,
 To leve al swyche foul manere,
 And for to kunne therynne
 That they wene no synne be ynne.⁴²

The Middle English version of the French romance *Partonope of Blois* (composed about the twelfth century) provides us with another echo of the times:

And ther-fore Stories for to rede
 Wolle I conselle, wyth-owten drede,
 Bothe olde and yonge that letteryd be.
 To the lewd also, parde,
 Is goode sum-tyme for to lere
 Thyng that fryste he ne knewe;
 And to soche folke olde thyng ys new,
 Whanne hyt ys in gestes songe,
 Or els in prose tolde wyth Tonge.⁴³

The moral Gower informs us that he often heard romances read:

And ek in other wise also
 Fulofte time it falleth so
 Min Ere with a good pitance
 Is fedd of reding of romance
 Of Ydione and Amadas.⁴⁴

I now come more definitely to the discussion of why I believe that Chaucer read his works aloud, and purposely had in mind to do so when he composed a number of his pieces.

As we have just seen, oral reading was decidedly the custom of his time and of former times. It is hardly to be supposed that Chaucer escaped the conditions and customs of his age.

Language is a medium whose content is gained either through *hearing* it or *reading* it. Chaucer was living in an era not far from that in which the great bulk of people became acquainted with all their romances, tales, songs, and poems through the ear alone. Their perceptive power, their manner

⁴² Mannyng, Robert, *Handlyng Synne*, Prologue, ll. 41-56.

⁴³ *Partonope of Blois*, ll. 18-27.

⁴⁴ *Confessio Amantis*, Bk. VI, ll. 875-80.

of learning, was *auditory* rather than *visual*. A modern scholar sums up the situation in one sentence: "We are prone to forget that the number of persons in the fourteenth century who heard a story read to them was much greater than the number of those who read it themselves."⁴⁵

Moreover, we must remember that when a country has two or more languages known by the same persons, in most cases one of these languages is an every-day sort of language, a knock-about, handy oral vehicle. In the fourteenth century three languages were common in England: Latin, French, and English. Latin and French were employed in important writings and were the means of communication between the learned and polite. The higher class spoke French from the time of the Conquest to the time of Edward III. Private letters were written in Latin. School boys turned their Latin into French—not English. The statutes of Oriel College, Oxford, prescribed in 1328 that students should converse in Latin, or at least in French. The minutes of London were in French. The proceedings of Parliament and of the House of Commons were in French. "Hence," Hallam is led to say, "English was seldom written, and hardly employed in prose till after the middle of the fourteenth century."⁴⁶ We often meet people nowadays who have a "reading knowledge" of one language, and a "speaking knowledge" of another. It is probable that there were men in Chaucer's time who could understand spoken English well enough, but who would have had deep wading trying to read a book written in English, because they had never become accustomed to reading that tongue. (I am not forgetting that English came more into use during the latter half of the fourteenth century.)

In spite of the fact that the fourteenth century was a time when education made great advances, there were doubtless many people of good birth who were strong intellectually, but who were unable to read or write with that facility and ease that would give pleasure. Signatures to deeds of private property do not appear in England till the fourteenth century.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ Kittredge, G. L., *Date of Troilus and Criseyde*, Chaucer Society, footnote, p. 52.

⁴⁶ Hallam, Henry, *Introduction to the Literature of Europe*, vol. 1, p. 49.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

Books were scarce and expensive in Chaucer's day. "Among all the church dignitaries whose wills are recorded in Bishop Strafford's Register at Exeter, 1395-1419, the largest library mentioned is only fourteen volumes." Sixty testators are included, among whom were a dean, two archdeacons, six vicars, and eighteen laymen, most of whom were rich. These sixty men possessed only two Bibles and 138 other books, 78 of which were church service books.⁴⁸ A few prices of books in those days will provide us with some notion of how costly manuscripts were. Edward III paid £66, 13s, 4d for an illuminated manuscript in 1331. Richard II paid for a Bible in French, a *Roman de la Rose*, and a *Roman de Perceval*, £28. We know that the purchasing power of a pound in the fourteenth century was greatly beyond what it is today. With the sum he expended for his manuscript Edward could have purchased 80 oxen or 280 pigs.⁴⁹

Then, there is, I believe, another cause which would account to some extent for the frequency of oral reading in Chaucer's age. The handwriting of the fourteenth century was perhaps the most difficult hand to read from the earliest times to that period. From the tenth century to the twelfth century large, legible lettering was the style. The letters still retained something of the squareness and straightness of the early Roman type employed in chiseling inscriptions on stone monuments. But since this kind of writing took up so much space and was expensive on manuscripts, the letters were reduced in size and were run more closely together, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.⁵⁰ One famous authority on paleography gives the following description of fourteenth century writing:

With the fourteenth century, we enter on a new phases in the history of Latin Paleography [the same thing is true of English paleography also]; and this and the following centuries are a period of gradual decadence from the high standard which had been attained in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. As if wearied by the exactness and rigidity of the book-hand of the thirteenth century, literary handwriting now became more lax, the letters fell away in beauty of shape, and in those manuscripts, such as biblical and liturgical, in which the old form

⁴⁸ Coulton, G. G., *Chaucer and his England*, p. 99.

⁴⁹ Jusserand, J. J., *English Wayfaring Life in the Fourteenth Century*, p. 197.

⁵⁰ Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, *Manuscript Writing and Lettering*.

of script remained prevalent, it degenerated into a mechanical and imitative hand. New styles of writing entered the field. The cursive element began to prevail and break up the formal conservatism of the old school; a round pliant character took the place of the older script; and mixed hands came into vogue, sometimes expressive of the particular classes of literature for which they were employed.⁵¹

We have no manuscript written by Chaucer. If he wrote a respectable book-hand, a second person might have been able to read it. Certainly if Chaucer wrote a cursory court-hand, or letter-hand, like that of the Prince of Wales in Henry IV's reign, or that of John Knox, or that of Shakespeare,—then only could those initiated into the mysteries of such an individual scrawl, read it by slow and painful degrees. Fourteenth century writing was markedly individual and varying.

In this connection, we must bear in mind also another difficulty. Manuscript writing at any period before modern times must necessarily have often been misinterpreted, or open to ambiguity, on account of the absence of any generally accepted system of paragraphing, punctuation, capitalization, or other mechanical devices to aid in interpreting correctly the written word. The widely variant spelling of an unliterary and uncultural language, like Middle English, certainly must have caused the reader to pause often to guess whether this particular word before him, which looked somewhat like one he had just passed but was spelled differently, could be the same word. An author reading his own manuscript would not be so dependent upon mechanical aids. He would know what he had in mind to say.

It is generally conceded that Chaucer was a court poet, a man who stood in favor with the court, and probably wrote for court people. If this is true, we have some grounds for believing that he read aloud his works to those for whom he wrote. The medieval person was quite human, and delighted in entertainments. The English monarchs had in their service minstrels. Richard II kept paid minstrels. But the minstrels of that late date employed their talents chiefly in making music and singing and in performing sleight-of-hand tricks rather than in telling tales, as their predecessors had done. Richard II

⁵¹ Thompson, Sir E. M., *Introduction to Greek and Latin Paleography*, p. 455.

attended religious plays and saw the York players perform in the streets of York. Jusserand, in remarking on the dearth of intellectual entertainment in the fourteenth century, observes: "The noble listened [to these minstrels]; he had no intellectual diversions; he gave little time if any to reading, which was not for him then an unmixed pleasure, and needed effort; there was no theatre for him to go to."⁵²

Chaucer's works have to me two forms of internal evidence that indicate that he intended to read them aloud. The first of these is so outstanding and frequent in its appearance as to catch the eye of the casual reader. I refer to those passages in which Chaucer seems to have been speaking directly to people present. It is hardly plausible to explain these passages on the ground that they are errors made by copyists of manuscripts, or slips made by the poet. They are too frequent, too personal, too appropriate, and rarely depend for their meaning upon a single word, as do some of his disputed and unintelligible passages, for example the word "write" in the *Knight's Tale* (1201), in *Melibeus* (Prol., 2154), in the *Franklin's Tale* (1594), and in the *Second Nun's Priest's Tale* (78), and the word "prose" in the *Man of Law's Tale* (Prol., 96). Witness these lines (the italics are mine):

T & C, I, 450: "This, trowe I, knoweth *al this companye*."

T & C, II, 29-31: "And for-ty if it happe in any wyse,
That *here be any lovere in this place*
That herkeneth . . ."

T & C, II, 43-4: "Eek scarsly been ther *in this place three*
That han in love seyde like and doon in al."

T & C, III, 491-5: "But now, paraunter, *som man wayten wolde*
That every word, or sonde, or look, or chere
Of Troilus that I rehersen sholde,
In al this whyle, unto his lady dere;
I trowe it *were a long thing for to here*."

Anel. & Arc., 165-8: "Or *what man might with-in the chamber dwelle,*
If I to him rehersen shal the helle,
That suffreth fair Anelida the queene
For fals Arcite, that did hir al this tene?"

LGW, 1554-5: "But *in this hous if any fals lover be,*
Right as him-self now doth, right so did he."

LGW, 2405: "Thus may these women prayen that hit here."

⁵² Jusserand, J. J., *English Wayfaring Life in the Fourteenth Century*, p. 201.

A second group of passages from Chaucer would seem to indicate that reading aloud was the custom in Chaucer's time:

T & C, II, 82-4: With-inne a paved parlour; and *they three*
Herden a mayden reden hem the geste
Of the sege of Thebes, whyl hem leste."

T & C, V, 1793-8: "And for ther is so great diversitee
 In English and in writing of our tonge,
 So preye I god that noon miswryte thee,
Ne thee mismetre for defaute of tonge.
 And red wher-so thou be, or elles songe,
 That thou be understonde I god beseche!"

(Incidentally, this passage bears out what I have previously said as to the diversity and instability of English in the fourteenth century.)

Astrol., Prol., 48: "Now wol I prey every discreet persone
 that *redeth or hereth this litel tretis . . .*"

Parson's T, Epilogue, 1081:

"Now preye I to hem alle that herkne this
 litel tretis or rede . . ."

Finally, I believe that Chaucer's writings have certain earmarks, characteristic of the man who writes for oral reading. He has variety. Dionysius of Halicarnassus in a letter to Pompeius advances a criticism on Herodotus which I think we may justly apply to our English author:

"Herodotus knew that every narrative of great length wearies the ears of the hearer, if it dwell without a break on the same subject; if pauses are introduced at intervals, it affects the mind agreeably. And so he desired to lend variety to his work, and imitated Homer."

Chaucer gains variety and crispness in his writings by the introduction of jokes, good humored thrusts at the weakness of human nature, touches of psychology, short aphoristic sayings thrown in here and there.

Space does not allow me to go into detail on this point; every one who has done much reading will immediately recognize a piece of writing that was composed originally with the intention of being given orally. Consider the lectures of William James, for example. A modern Greek scholar, Jevons, attributes the charm and clarity of Herodotus to the fact that the Greek historian wrote for the hearer:

The charm of Herodotus is, then, that in him we are listening to one who has seen many cities and known many men, and is not writing

a book, but telling in his fresh old age the brave deeds that were done before him, and describing the marvels of strange lands which in his youth he himself has seen. That Herodotus' narrative style has the characteristics of a tale told rather than of a book written is no accident, nor is it to be explained solely by reference to the temper of the man. It is due to the fact that Herodotus wrote his work for oral delivery, and not for the reading public.⁵³

⁵³ Jevons, F. B., *A History of Greek Literature*, 311.

✓ The Farmers' Alliance in Florida

JAMES O. KNAUSS

Florida State College

Agriculturally speaking, Florida may be divided into two parts, almost equal in area, by a line extending from the mouth of the Suwanee River on the Gulf of Mexico to Daytona on the Atlantic coast. Between 1885 and 1890 these two sections faced different problems. The northern district, which had been since ante-bellum days a great cotton raising centre, had the same problems as the adjacent states of Georgia and Alabama—problems arising chiefly from the changed condition of the laboring class and from the scarcity of money.¹ Conditions seemed to be growing worse as the last decade of the century approached.

On the other hand, the southern part of the state was in a more hopeful frame of mind. Its two chief problems were the marketing of its perishable produce, citrus fruits and vegetables, and the attraction of more settlers.² Any attempt to interest the inhabitants of this section would have to take these factors into consideration. A solution of the marketing problem had been attempted at least as early as 1873, when the Florida Fruit Growers' Association was organized.³ In 1885 the Florida Fruit Exchange was started for the specific purpose of finding markets for oranges, without the help of the commission merchants.⁴ Although the solution was not complete, the South Floridians were hopeful of eventual success. The question of inducing immigration was in a more unsatisfactory condition, despite the advertising done by state and local authorities.

When the representatives of the Farmers' Alliance entered the state, they were confronted not only by the ordinary prob-

¹ For a good description of these conditions see Arnett, A. M., *The Populist Movement in Georgia*, Ch. II. B. B. Kendrick has a good short article on *Agrarian Discontent in the South, 1880-1900*, in the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1920*. Solon J. Buck's two books, *The Granger Movement and The Agrarian Crusade*, also discuss briefly post bellum conditions among southern farmers.

² In 1890 it contained about 100,000 inhabitants, approximately one-fourth of the population of the state. See *Abstract of the Eleventh Census, 1890*, pp. 6, 31.

³ *Florida Dispatch* (file in Library of Congress) of February 21, 1887, mentions the fourteenth annual meeting.

⁴ *Ibid.*, January 3, 1887, and many other numbers.

lems of organization and by those peculiar to each community, but also by the difficulty of including in their program plans that would attract the inhabitants of the two districts having such divergent aims. In June 1887, Oswald Wilson and James B. Young arrived as organizers from Texas. Wilson started his work in Marianna, Jackson County, in the cotton country, and Young in Citrus County, on the border line between north and south Florida. Each organized a sub-alliance on June 15 of that year.⁵ This was the beginning of an intensive Alliance campaign in Florida. Sixty-five local alliances, with a membership of almost 2,000, had been started by October 4, when a state organization was perfected by a convention held in Marianna.⁶ In this convention, the counties of Bradford, Calhoun, Gadsden, Jackson, Levy, Liberty, Madison, Walton, Washington, Holmes, Citrus, and Duval were represented,—all except two, Levy and Citrus, being north Florida counties. There were probably three reasons for this preponderance: first, the Alliance came from a state that had problems similar to those of north Florida, and knew how to appeal to the inhabitants of this locality; second, the ground had been broken for the Alliance by a number of local unions, of which more later; third, Wilson was probably a better organizer than Young.

Oswald Wilson dominated the Florida Alliance for more than two years after its organization. When he came to the state in June 1887, he was less than twenty-seven years of age, having been born in Brooks County, Georgia, on October 27, 1860. His parents moved to Texas in 1865, back to Georgia in 1870, and again to Texas in 1873. He was closely connected with the Farmers' Alliance in Texas from its inception. His friend, W. T. Baggett, organized the first Alliance in Parker County, Texas, in July 1879, and he himself was one of the charter members of the Little River Alliance.⁷ Thus, young and enthusiastic, thoroughly understanding the complaints and troubles of the southern farmer, it is no wonder that he became the leading figure in the Alliance movement of Florida.

⁵ *Ibid.*, January 23, 1890.

⁶ *Ibid.*, October 10, 1887.

⁷ *Ibid.*, July 25, 1889.

The Marianna convention of October 4, elected Wilson president of the State Alliance and Young lecturer. The other state officers were William Gomm, vice-president; T. A. Hall, secretary; J. W. Pooser, treasurer; W. A. Bryant, chaplain; W. B. Sheppard, assistant lecturer; and W. B. Mozeley, sergeant-at-arms. At the same time, a board of publication was appointed, which perfected an organization by choosing A. H. Manville president of the board, R. B. Stapleton vice-president, and J. W. Pooser secretary and treasurer. They purchased the outfit and good will of the *West Florida Inquirer*, of Marianna, and made it the state organ of the Alliance under the name of the *Florida Farmers' Alliance*. Oswald Wilson was made editor and business manager of the paper.⁸

After the Florida Alliance was thus launched, the organization took up the two-fold task of aiding the farmers and of gaining new members. Since the latter was necessarily preliminary to the former, it must be discussed first. Mention has already been made of local farmers' unions. Details about them are lacking, but some were started as early as March 1887.⁹ At least twelve counties had local unions. Representatives from nine of these counties, Alachua, Bradford, Columbia, Putnam, Suwannee, Levy, Duval, Citrus, and Baker, (all except three cotton raising districts almost exclusively) met the week after the organization of the state Alliance, on October 12, 1887, at Gainesville, and organized a state "Union". In this convention there were represented a total of 35 clubs, composed of approximately 1700 members.¹⁰ R. F. Rogers was chosen president. Naturally, the Alliance attempted to effect a consolidation with the Union,—an attempt successfully carried out in January 1888, when the Union united with the Alliance, because, as its president declared, the objects of each were the same and the Alliance had a national head.

The rise and decline of the Alliance may be traced with some degree of accuracy. The sixty-five local alliances of October 1887, had increased to ninety-one by the beginning

⁸ *Ibid.*, October 10, 1887.

⁹ See R. F. Rogers' address in *Florida Dispatch*, January 23, 1890.

¹⁰ *Florida Dispatch*, October 17, 1887.

of November,¹¹ and to one hundred and twenty by the middle of the month.¹² Thereafter, no more statistics are available before 1889. The intervening year was doubtless a period of steady progress. A second state convention, at which Wilson was re-elected president, was held at Madison in April, 1888.¹³ At the meeting held at Jacksonville in January, 1889, Wilson resigned the presidency, and R. F. Rogers became president and A. P. Baskin secretary.¹⁴ This change in officers shows that the members felt that the State Alliance was now completely organized and could conduct its affairs without much direction from outside organizers. By July 1889, three hundred and seventy-two local alliances were reported in twenty-four counties,¹⁵ and by September, four hundred and thirty-eight.¹⁶ In an alliance convention held in Jacksonville on September 25, thirty counties were represented, at least ten of which were south Florida counties,—Citrus, DeSoto, Hernando, Hillsborough, Levy, Lake, Pasco, Polk, Sumter and Volusia. In seven of these an organization had probably been perfected during the preceding six months, for the alliance officials complained in April that the orange belt was not yet represented.¹⁷ It was estimated that the Alliance had 20,000 members in July¹⁸ and 25,000 in December, 1889.¹⁹ By April 1890, alliances were flourishing in all except four counties of Florida,²⁰—one small county in the north, Franklin, with a population of 3,308; and three in the south, Lee with 1,414 inhabitants, Dade with 861 people, and Monroe with 18,786. The last one was the most southern county in the state, and most of its inhabitants were concentrated in the city of Key West.

During the year 1890 and the first months of 1891 the Alliance was at the height of its influence. With a member-

¹¹ *Ibid.*, November 7, 1887.

¹² *Ibid.*, November 14, 1887.

¹³ *Ibid.*, July 25, 1889.

¹⁴ W. Scott Morgan, *History of the Wheel and Alliance and the Impending Revolution*, p. 116.

¹⁵ *Florida Dispatch*, July 25, 1889.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, September 26, 1889.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, May 2, 1889.

¹⁸ *National Economist*, July 13, 1889. (Files in the Library of Congress and the New York Public Library.)

¹⁹ Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

²⁰ *Florida Dispatch*, January 30, 1890, April 10, 1890.

ship that included almost one-half of the voting population of the state, the assertion made in *Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia* may readily be believed, that the members of the Farmers' Alliance formed a large part of the Democratic state convention of 1890, and that the platform was as much a declaration of Alliance principles as of Democratic doctrine.²¹ The strength of the organization in these years is also evidenced by the number of Alliance papers that came into existence. As noted above, the *Florida Farmers' Alliance* was begun in October 1887, as the official state organ. Its name was changed to the *Farmers' Alliance of Florida and Georgia*, in December 1887, when the convention that formed the Georgia Alliance made the paper the official publication of the new organization.²² This arrangement continued for a short time only. The paper was purchased by the *Florida Dispatch* in January 1889,²³ which henceforward was the official organ for the state organization, and contained a special department with the caption, *The Farmers' Alliance*, under the supervision of a special editor. During 1890 and 1891, at least seven Alliance papers appeared.²⁴

Probably the apogee of the Alliance's influence was reached at the time of the Ocala Convention in December 1890. After that, the decline began. On August 20, 1891, the *Florida Dispatch* denied the rumor that the organization was losing strength, declaring that only seven of the 676 local and county alliances had surrendered their charters. However, the paper did not hint at a large number that had become moribund. On November 11, the publication admitted that the entire membership was less than sixty-five hundred. Never again was the Florida Farmers' Alliance destined to be strong.

To understand some of the causes for these rapid changes in the fortunes of the organization, it is necessary to retrace our steps and see how the Alliance attempted to aid the farmers

²¹ *Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia and Register of Important Events of the Year 1890*, p. 319.

²² *Florida Dispatch*, January 16, 1888.

²³ *Ibid.*, January 28, 1889; February 7, 1889.

²⁴ *The Florida Alliance of Lakeland*; *The Alliance Farmer of Selman*; the *Banner of Liberty of Live Oak*; the *Farmers Advocate of Tampa*, published by W. C. Crum from March, 1890, to January 1891; *The Alliance of Tallahassee*, published by W. I. Vason from February, 1891, to December, 1891; the *Alliance Farmer of Chipley* and the *Ocala Demands of Ocala*.

in Florida. Its activities may be divided into two more or less distinct periods: the earlier one before 1891, when the emphasis was placed on teaching the farmers improved agricultural methods and the value of cooperation, and the later one beginning about 1891, when the Alliance became more and more involved in politics. Improved ways of farming were stressed by the lecturers, by many articles in the various Alliance papers, and in the meetings of the local clubs. The chief organ of co-operative buying and selling in Florida, as well as in other states, was a state exchange. The agent of the exchange was located at some central point where he received the orders of the clubs or of the counties. Thus he could, by buying in quantities, obtain a substantial reduction in purchase prices. The produce of the local and county alliances would also be sent to him for disposal. When the State Alliance was started in October 1887, it was felt that the organization was not yet strong enough to begin a state exchange, and consequently recommendations were made that each county should elect a business agent, and each sub-alliance a trade committee.²⁵ Co-operative stores were also started, the first ones in the county seats of Levy and Jackson Counties,²⁶ followed immediately by four others.²⁷ However, everybody recognized this work as simply preparatory to a state exchange. Hence on May 18, 1888, the Florida Exchange, with headquarters at Jacksonville, was organized with the much officed Oswald Wilson as president. Its authorized capital was \$150,000, divided into 1500 shares.²⁸ Although the work was seriously hampered by an epidemic of yellow fever, there were branch exchanges in ten counties by the end of April 1889.²⁹ A respectable amount of business was transacted. Up to June 1, 1889, the exchange had handled 15,732 packages of vegetables and fruits, and had filled orders for supplies amounting to \$37,850.³⁰

Nevertheless, the enterprise was not as successful as its promoters desired. There were various reasons for this: first,

²⁵ *Florida Dispatch*, October 24, 1887.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, November 7, 1887.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, November 14, 1887.

²⁸ *National Economist*, July 13, 1889.

²⁹ *Florida Dispatch*, May 9, 1889.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, July 11, 1889.

the Florida Fruit Exchange handled almost all the citrus fruit, as already mentioned; second, the western counties of Florida found it cheaper to ship their produce directly north by rail or by steamer;³¹ third, there was the usual cut-throat competition of the private merchants; fourth, the Alliance members themselves did not realize just what the exchange could do for them;³² and fifth, there was no warehouse for the storage of non-perishable goods so that they could be held until the market was right.

The lack of a warehouse was especially felt. After much agitation, and after delegates from the sea island cotton belt had met in Lake City and adopted resolutions that they would deal through the exchange,³³ a warehouse was at last started in Jacksonville.³⁴ This aided in obtaining the coöperation of the cotton growers of the northeastern part of the state, but those of western Florida apparently remained aloof. Although a warehouse for this region was discussed, the suggestion was never taken up.

In order to buy and sell still more advantageously, and especially to attract the South Floridians, a branch exchange was started in New York at Number 1, William Street, about the same time that the warehouse in Jacksonville was opened,³⁵ with Oswald Wilson as manager. He tried to make it a national affair, and opened trade with almost all the states in which the Alliance was organized.³⁶ He induced W. C. Crum, the publisher of the *Tampa Farmers' Advocate*, to move his material to New York and start the *Wall Street Farmer* on January 10, 1891, as the organ of the exchange.³⁷ All efforts to interest the south Floridians and others were unavailing, and the New York branch closed about the beginning of February.³⁸

The Florida Alliance tried to teach its members the value of the state exchange by having a lecturer in the field all the time explaining its functions, and by sending a circular letter

³¹ *Ibid.*, August 15, 1889.

³² *National Economist*, July 13, 1889.

³³ *Florida Dispatch*, August 15, 1889.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, October 31, 1889.

³⁵ *National Economist*, September 28, 1889.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, October 25, 1890.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, January 24, 1891.

³⁸ Crum attempted to continue the *Farmer*.

with information about it to each member.³⁹ However, all of these attempts to improve the exchange were unsuccessful. When S. S. Harvey of Escambia County was made its president in January 1891, he frankly admitted in an address that the affairs of the exchange were very unsatisfactory. Fifteen thousand dollars were due the organization from Alliance members, with the result that it owed several thousand dollars. He also stressed the necessity of three or more centrally located distributing points.⁴⁰ Despite these handicaps, the Exchange struggled along until some time in 1892. The *Florida Dispatch* of September 8, 1892, called it "this whilom institution" and "that humiliating fiasco", and bitterly attacked the agent as a parasite of the Farmers' Alliance.

When the Florida Alliance first definitely entered into politics is not known, but we can readily see that its entrance was inevitable. Since the organization believed that the attempts of the farmers to help themselves should be supplemented by governmental action, the only question arising was whether the Alliance should be non-partisan, supporting the official of any party who would subscribe to its demands, or whether one party should be supported to the exclusion of the others. Naturally, the conservatives favored the former plan, while the radically minded were in favor of the latter. When R. F. Rogers was elected president and A. P. Baskin secretary in January 1889,⁴¹ the two wings were represented, Rogers being conservative and Baskin radical. As early as January 1890, when Rogres was re-elected president, he urged the Alliance to remain non-partisan.⁴² It was difficult to follow this admonition, as only one party to all intents and purposes remained in Florida, the opposition to the Democrats having been practically legislated out of existence in 1889 by the individual ballot box system.⁴³ Hence the Alliance could not use one party as a foil to the other.

³⁹ *National Economist*, July 13, 1889.

⁴⁰ *Florida Dispatch*, February 26, 1891.

⁴¹ See above.

⁴² *Florida Dispatch*, January 23, 1890.

⁴³ See *Acts and Resolutions adopted by the Legislature of Florida* (session of 1889), p. 102. This law provided separate ballots and separate ballot-boxes for each of the chief elective offices. The ballot-boxes were marked distinctly with the name of the office. All ballots for a certain office were to be placed in the box

In spite of the difficulty, the attempt was made. The farmers, who were in control of the Democratic state convention of 1890, wrote into the platform the following resolutions:

"That we urge our members in both branches of Congress to advocate all legislation tending to aid and encourage the agricultural and laboring interests of the country.

"That in the revision of the present protective tariff, the burdens now resting on the agricultural and laboring classes shall be reduced to a fair and equitable basis not to exceed the requirements of the government honestly and economically administered.

"That we advocate the passage of laws that will effectually prevent the creation of trusts and combines, and prohibit speculation that seeks to interfere with prices of prime necessities and agricultural products.

"That we persistently and continuously oppose the pernicious system of contracting the circulating medium of the country as now conducted by the National Government.

"That the consideration of the Sub-Treasury bill in Congress indicates a desire upon the part of the whole people for the increase of a circulating medium, and that it is the duty of our members of Congress to secure the passage of some law that will give the requisite relief.

"That we advocate the support of all measures for the reduction of county, State and national taxation, asserting that all taxation should be based upon a uniform system of equalization, operative alike upon capital and labor, that all bear equally their just proportion of the burden, and that taxation should be levied for revenue only, and then only under a rigid system of economic and judicious administration of government."⁴⁴

These were indeed Alliance planks. This platform was in marked contrast with the one of 1888 in which the agricultural interests were ignored. Probably the most striking feature of

specified. No ballots in a wrong box were to be counted. Since most of the negroes were illiterate and since the white Democratic election commissioners refused to tell them in which boxes to place the ballots, the black vote, which was almost entirely Republican, was practically eliminated. The decrease in the number of votes cast was striking: in 1888 the Republican candidate for governor received 26,485 votes; in 1890 the Republican candidates for Comptroller received only 4,711 votes. (From official returns in the Secretary of State's office, Tallahassee, Florida.)

⁴⁴ *Appleton's Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1890, p. 319.

the platform is the straddling plank relating to the sub-treasury plan.⁴⁵ It shows that the Democratic party was willing to do much to court the favor of the powerful Alliance but would hedge on this plan. It is also to be noted that nothing is said about government ownership of railroads,—another important Alliance demand.

It is probable that the Democrats might have included these radical demands in their platform if the Alliance had been unanimously in favor of them, but there was an influential minority in opposition. For instance, the Leon County Farmers' Alliance drafted these seven demands: tax reduction and equalization, revision of the protective tariff, prevention of trusts, no contraction of the circulating medium, railroads to remain competitive, free and unlimited coinage of silver, public officials to be servants not masters of the people.⁴⁶ No mention is made of the sub-treasury plan nor of government ownership of railroads. On the other hand, the editor of the Alliance department of the *Florida Dispatch*,⁴⁷ as well as many other prominent members of the organization, supported the sub-treasury plan.

The non-partisan character of the Alliance seemed to be vindicated in the fall election of 1890, when more than three-fifths of the members of the state legislature were Alliance men;⁴⁸ but an acute observer could detect dangers everywhere. The leaders in state and nation were becoming more radical, urging advanced legislation which the Democrats would almost certainly refuse to enact. If the Democrats should refuse to do this, what would the Alliance do? The friends and foes of the organization were waiting to see what would be done in the National Convention of the Alliance, which was scheduled to meet at Ocala, on December 2, 1890. Would it affirm or repeal the radical demands made at the St. Louis convention of the preceding year?

The Ocala convention, considered by all historians as part of the background of the Populist movement, was beyond any

⁴⁵ For discussion of sub-treasury plan, see Arnett, *op. cit.*, p. 95 ff.

⁴⁶ *Florida Dispatch*, July 17, 1890.

⁴⁷ *National Economist*, October 4, 1890.

⁴⁸ *Florida Dispatch*, March 5, 1891; May 14, 1891.

doubt the most important single event in the history of agrarian discontent in Florida. It may be viewed from two angles: first, as a scheme for advertising Florida; and secondly, as the crucial struggle between the conservative and radical wings of the Farmers' Alliance. The first of these views was particularly in the minds of the Florida delegates when they invited, at the time of the St. Louis convention, the organization to hold its next meeting in Florida. They were surprised and delighted when the invitation was accepted.⁴⁹ Such a convention with its resultant publicity would attract settlers to the state, and thus the Alliance might be completely successful in interesting the lukewarm South Floridians in the organization.

When the delegates to the St. Louis convention returned home, they immediately started plans to entertain the visitors. It was soon discovered that Jacksonville, the city that had been selected as the meeting place, was not sufficiently interested to offer much assistance. It was estimated that the inducements made by the town were worth fifteen hundred dollars at the most. However, Ocala, the county seat of the prosperous Marion county, on the border line of south Florida, made a much more liberal offer. The inhabitants of this city offered the free use of the building of the Semi-Tropical Exposition, promised to entertain all Alliance members at half price and the national officers and delegates free. In addition to this, seven thousand dollars in cash was to be given to the Alliance. These terms caused the National Executive Board to change the place of meeting on June 20, 1890, to Ocala.⁵⁰

The Florida Alliance officers decided to have an exhibition of state products at the convention. A careful program for the collection of these products was mapped out by President Rogers. A director was appointed for each county, who chose an active member from each sub-alliance to collect the exhibits. All exhibits were to be in the hands of the county directors by November 24, and to be shipped to Ocala not later than November 25. The exposition was scheduled to open on December 1, the day before the formal opening of the convention. The alliance urged that each county should put on exhibit "a fair

⁴⁹ This information was given to me by a surviving high official of the Alliance.

⁵⁰ *Florida Dispatch*, July 3, 1890.

sample of everything that the soil of the county produced". Fruits, "especially citrus", and vegetables were particularly desired.⁵¹ All except ten counties were represented by exhibits.⁵²

Besides the exposition and free entertainment, other methods were devised to show true Floridian hospitality to the delegates. One thousand boxes of oranges were ordered to be distributed among the visitors.⁵³ The Louisville and Nashville Railroad offered free transportation to the delegates.⁵⁴ Fleming, the governor of the State, gave a cordial address of welcome on the opening day of the convention.⁵⁵ As a climax to this reception, there was an extended excursion through Florida, after the close of the sessions. The impression upon the delegates was well described by a contemporary :

"Carriages were furnished (in Ocala) for drives, receptions were held, public demonstrations of many kinds were furnished, hotel bills were paid, and orange and lemon groves were for the time given over to fruit hungry people. Excursions were arranged to points of interest, notable among which was 'Silver Springs', the 'Phosphate Quarries', and the 'Cedar Mills' at Homasassa. After the adjournment of the Supreme Council, almost the entire delegation started on a two weeks' pleasure trip, which covered the points of interest in the state. A special train was furnished free by the different lines of railroads, and the trip took in such noted points of interest as Tampa Bay, the St. Cloud Sugar Mills, Indian River, DeLeon Springs, St. Augustine, Jacksonville, Tallahassee, Pensacola, etc. No such grand excursion had ever before been given to representatives of wealth-producing people as this, and Senator Mann,⁵⁶ of Florida, will long be remembered, with the kindest of feeling by all who attended this meeting, as the moving spirit who made such an enjoyable trip possible."⁵⁷

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, September 11, 1890.

⁵² *Ibid.*, December 11, 1890.

⁵³ *National Economist*, September 6, 1890.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, November 8, 1890.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, December 13, 1890.

⁵⁶ State Senator A. S. Mann was chairman of the committee which had charge of making preparations for the convention. See *Economist*, October 25, 1890.

⁵⁷ *Handbook and History of National Farmers' Alliance and Industrial Union*, p. 41 (in Library of Congress).

Florida had given a really fine reception to the National Farmers' Alliance. To the superficial observer, it appeared that the organization would be irresistible in the state, and probably in the nation, but the shrewd political diagnosticians saw the beginning of the end. The Ocala convention placed the power definitely in the hands of the radicals, thus continuing the work of the St. Louis convention. Although the official records of the proceedings of the Ocala meeting are not available, the results are apparent in the seven demands adopted,—the famous "Ocala Demands", which follow in their entirety:

"1 a. We demand the abolition of National Banks.

"b. We demand that the government shall establish sub-treasuries or depositaries in the several states, which shall loan money directly to the people, at a low rate of interest, not to exceed 2 per cent per annum, on non-perishable farm products and also upon real estate, with proper limitations upon the quantity of land and amount of money.

"c. We demand that the amount of the circulating medium be speedily increased to not less than \$50 per capita.

"2. We demand that Congress shall pass such laws as shall effectually prevent the dealing in futures of all agricultural and mechanical productions; preserving a stringent system of procedure in trials as shall secure prompt conviction, and imposing such penalties as shall secure the most perfect compliance with the law.

"3. We condemn the silver bill recently passed by Congress, and demand in lieu thereof the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

"4. We demand the passage of laws prohibiting alien ownership of land, and that Congress take prompt action to devise some plan to obtain all lands now owned by aliens and foreign syndicates; and that all lands now owned by railroads and other corporations in excess of such as is actually used and needed by them be reclaimed by the government, and held for actual settlers only.

"5. Believing in the doctrine of equal right to all and special privileges to none, we demand that our national legislation shall be so framed in the future as not to build up one industry at

the expense of another; and we further demand a removal of the existing heavy tariff tax from the necessities of life that the poor of our land must have; we further demand a just and equitable system of graduated tax on incomes; we believe that the money of the country should be kept as much as possible in the hands of the people, and hence we demand that all national and state revenue shall be limited to the necessary expenses of the government economically and honestly administered.

"6. We demand the most rigid, honest, and just state and national governmental control and supervision of the means of public communication and transportation, and if this control and supervision does not remove the abuse now existing, we demand the government ownership of such means of communication and transportation.

"7. We demand that the Congress of the United States submit an amendment to the constitution providing for the election of United States Senators by direct vote of the people of each state."⁵⁸

All of these demands except the first one were passed unanimously, and very few voted against it.⁵⁹ However, the victory was a pyrrhic one, as many members of the local alliances opposed this platform. Within two months the Sarasota Alliance of south Florida dissolved because of the sub-treasury plan,⁶⁰ and others were torn by internal strife. Nevertheless, the leaders of the state organization succeeded in having the demands ratified by a vote of 71 to 5 in the annual state convention held in Dade City on October 20, 1891, only Orange County voting against such action.⁶¹

The demoralization started by the dissatisfaction with the Exchange, and with the Ocala Demands, was accentuated by the inefficiency of the state legislature, which held its regular biennial session in April and May, 1891. The majority of its members were Alliance men. Much was expected of them, but they showed no cohesion. The greater part of the session was consumed in an attempt to elect a successor to United States Sen-

⁵⁸ *Times Union*, of Jacksonville, December 9, 1890. Also in *National Economist*.

⁵⁹ *National Economist*, December 20, 1890.

⁶⁰ *Florida Dispatch*, February 12, 1891.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, October 29, 1891.

ator Wilkinson Call.⁶² The balloting lasted from April 12 to May 26, and when an election was at last made, it was contested vigorously in the United States Senate.⁶³ Although President Rogers and some other leaders of the Alliance were opposed to Call, the members of the organization were about equally divided.⁶⁴ When the end of the session came, the Alliance men returned to a dissatisfied constituency; they could point to very few constructive measures that were distinctly the work of the organization. This poor showing of the Alliance legislators, it is fair to assume, caused a further shrinkage in membership, so that by the time of the state convention in October, it was hardly more than one-fourth as large as it had been the preceding year. The most notable event of this convention was the defeat of Rogers for the presidency by the more radical A. P. Baskin, who had been secretary since 1889.⁶⁵

The Florida Alliance drifted ever more rapidly toward the third party that was being formed. When the Democrats renominated Cleveland, Baskin declared, "Cleveland's nomination will add many votes to the People's Party in Florida. It is the feather that break's the camel's back."⁶⁶ Baskin became the gubernatorial candidate of the People's Party, received 8,309 votes against his opponent's 32,064,⁶⁷ and carried five north Florida counties. Thereafter, the Florida Alliance was an adjunct of the new party. The officers elected at the annual meeting in 1893 were all avowed Populists except one.⁶⁸

The causes of the rapid decline of the Farmer's Alliance in Florida are mostly quite apparent. Probably the chief one was the fact that the organization was unable to fulfill its promises, as evidenced by the failure of the exchange and the coöperative stores, and by the futility of its legislative attempts. This inability was due principally to the inexperience of the mem-

⁶² Appleton's *Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1891, p. 302.

⁶³ *Congressional Record*, fifty-second Congress, first session, pp. 2, 6, 512, 846, et al.

⁶⁴ *Florida Dispatch*, April 23, 1891; May 14, 1891.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, October 29, 1891.

⁶⁶ *National Economist*, July 2, 1891.

⁶⁷ From election returns in the office of the Secretary of State, Tallahassee. The Republicans did not nominate a state Ticket.

⁶⁸ *Floridian*, of Tallahassee, November 4, 1893. (In Library of Congress.)

bers, and the cleavage into conservatives and radicals,—usual weaknesses in organizations of protest. The division of the state into two sections with different products and different problems, and the unusual length of north Florida so that the eastern and western sections had different problems of transportation, were very important causes. Another reason for the decline was the refusal of Floridians in large numbers to forsake the Democratic party. The chief cause of this was probably the lack of really strong leaders in the Alliance; there were certainly no dynamic personalities in Florida like Tom Watson of Georgia. Of course, another reason for clinging to the old party was the fear that the negro might again become dominant,—reconstruction days had ended in the state a bare fifteen years before. The chief cause of the failure of the Alliance may have been the weaknesses inherent in the movement and its policies. This, however, is incapable of proof, and its consideration would lead us too far afield.

The Silent Novelists

ROBERT WITHINGTON
Northampton, Massachusetts

"Some poet has observed," says Thackeray, somewhere, "that if any man would write down what has really happened to him in this mortal life, he would be sure to make a good book, though he never met with a single adventure from his birth to his burial." This is only another way of saying that each of us is the hero of his own story; and many of us will admit that it is much more exciting to live a novel than to read one. As to "never meeting with a single adventure"—all life is an adventure, and there are, perhaps, fewer of us than one would suppose, who meet it with eyes shut to the possibilities, if not to the meaning, of existence. Even in a life of routine, we are constantly taking chances; we are—most of us—struggling to wrest a living either from the earth or from the world, and the outcome of the struggle is an adventure in itself. We see great matters turn on little things—the course of a life changed by an accident, a chance remark bear undreamed-of fruit; and we are tempted to wonder if there is such a thing as an unimportant happening.

But not only are we the heroes of our own novels—be they romances, stirring stories of adventure, calm pastorals, or thrilling tales of high finance and business success—we are also minor characters in the novels of our neighbors. We may be blind to the plots and characters in the life about us, but we are rarely oblivious of the chain of events, and the influence of environment, which go to make up our own story—a story which has the additional interest of constantly being developed. And just as we figure, without knowing it, in the novels of people we never heard of, so others, equally unknown to us, figure indirectly in ours—again, without our becoming aware of them. We do not, perhaps, realize the possibility of this, until we read such a tale as *Our Mutual Friend*, in which many of the characters, all bound together as they are, never meet—never even hear of each other.

If life helps us to interpret literature, good literature helps us to interpret life; the two work together in a kind of "virtuous circle." The very young get their idea of love from novels—but one who has loved appreciates the romances more. And never was a story "continued in our next" followed with half the interest with which a lover watches his rival and his mistress as, all unconscious that he is constructing a novel, he develops the succeeding chapter!

Mr. George B. Shaw once pointed out in a lecture that if the sole task of the dramatist—and he might have included novelist and poet—were to depict life, no one would go to the theatre: all we should have to do for our entertainment and instruction would be simply to look about us. Life is interpreted by the dramatist—by the poet, in the broadest sense of the word—because he selects from apparent chaos those events and people that have a direct bearing on the incidents and characters which he portrays; or he gives us his intimate thoughts on the universe, which are the product of his observation, insight, and imagination.

"You should write a novel," said Mrs. Swancourt to Elfride. "The regular resource of people who don't go enough into the world to live a novel is to write one." Mrs. Swancourt herself had learned the language of Nature's illegitimate sister, Artificiality; "and the fibbing of eyes, the contempt of nose-tips, the indignation of back hair, the laughter of clothes, the cynicism of footsteps, and the various emotions lying in walking-stick twirls, hat-lifting, the elevation of parasols, the carriage of umbrellas, become [said she] as A B C to me."

In those rare moments when we are aware of our own novels, the excitement attendant upon their development (aside from the fact that the outcome means so much to *us*) is due to the feeling that we cannot always control the other characters involved. Writers sometimes have this experience, too; Mr. Roundabout finds that there is a kind of fatalism in his novels: "They *must* go a certain way, in spite of themselves. I have been surprised at the observations made by some of my characters. It seems as if an occult Power was moving the pen. The personage does or says something, and I ask, How the dickens did he come to think of that? . . . We spake anon

of the inflated style of some writers. What if there is also an afflated style,—when a writer is like a Pythoness on her oracle tripod, and mighty words, words which he cannot help, come blowing, and bellowing, and whistling, and moaning through the speaking pipes of his bodily organ? . . . Who has not felt that little shock which arises when a person, a place, some words in a book (there is always a collocation) present themselves to you, and you know that you have before met the same person, words, scene, and so forth?"

Nor are the men who write books (as Mr. Roundabout discovered "in a pretty large experience") superior in wit and learning to those who don't write at all. We do not all care to print our emotions, or our observations on the life around us—even if we have the ability to set them down on paper; but if we can appreciate a good novel, we are not wholly unconscious of the novel we are ourselves building, chapter by chapter, with the years.

A long time ago, an uncle took his schoolboy nephew to what the youngster was convinced was the most thrilling melodrama ever written. At any rate, he has never seen anything since which equals his memory of it. As he recalls the play, there were five acts, and each act had six or seven scenes, each of which was more exciting than the one which preceded it. The end of every act was a climax in itself; and the play progressed, holding the boy breathless, until the tremendous scene at the end, where the villain and some of the minor heroes were swept over a precipice in the Alps by a sudden avalanche which left the hero, reunited at last to the heroine, on the very edge of the awful chasm where the trembling girl was held in his strong embrace. Probably the secondary heroes, who conveniently went into the abyss with the villain, were happier than if they had lived to witness the hero's felicity; but the erstwhile schoolboy can still remember the regret with which he saw them disappear.

Every story is capable of a certain shift in emphasis, if told from another angle—from the point of view of another character. The minor figure in one novel or play is the protagonist of his own story; and the end does not come until "the servant whom we forget that we possess" (as Stevenson calls the grave-

digger) has done his job. Often, a tale told with the emphasis of comedy contains certain minor characters who are capable of being developed into tragic figures—witness, for instance, Hero in *Much Ado About Nothing*; and one would hesitate to probe beneath the cheerful exterior of some Tom Pinch to analyze the heart-throbs of his lonely life. On the other hand, Alice and Bartrum—main figures in their own story—are in the background of Elia's essay—mere shadows in one of the most touching and charming reveries of a bachelor ever penned.

Perhaps one of the phrases which helped to earn the title of cynic for Thackeray—how undeserved, the thoughtful readers of that novelist know!—was the dictum in *Henry Esmond*: From the loss of a tooth to that of a mistress, there's no pang that's not bearable. The brave smile of Lamb bears witness to the truth of this remark, and hundreds of our silent novelists will echo it from their own experience. Those readers who have never loved, will pity Charles Ravenshoe when Adelaide deserts him; but those who have, will sympathize more deeply, and understand. Her own unworthiness plays little part in his emotions, as Dora's does in those of David Copperfield; and what reader can boast that he was never blind himself?

Many lyrics cannot be appreciated by thoughtless undergraduates, and throughout our lives we find that experience opens our eyes to the full meaning of certain phrases which, at one time, fell carelessly from our unthinking lips. "The pangs of unrequited love" echos melodiously in *Rigoletto*; but until we have felt those pangs, the phrase is empty. What can young children, glibly repeating in Sunday school, "the peace that passeth understanding," know of such a peace? and how many children of a larger growth catch the full force of words which haunt their tongues? A clergyman once told me that the first time he went to church, after the death of his wife, the familiar words of the service took on an entirely new meaning; "I am beginning to learn," he said, "things that I thought I knew long since."

And so we weave the experiences which go to make up our novels, growing, the while, in sympathy and understanding, as we live. Life is not stagnation—and fewer of us really stag-

nate than might be imagined. Life is thinking and feeling—perhaps the romanticist is right in putting his chief emphasis on the latter—and it is not always pleasant; life is hard, and no one can be called happy until he is out of it, as we read in one of Montaigne's essays. Ampedo's dying speech in *Old Fortunatus*: "No man before his end is truly blest," echoes Gorboduc's "No man happie till his end be seene," and both repeat Sophocles's Coryphée at the end of *Œdipus Rex*:

. . . . jusqu'au jour qui termine la vie
 Ne regardons personne avec un œil d'envie!
 Peut-on jamais prévoir les derniers coups du sort?
 Ne proclamons heureux nul homme . . . avant sa mort.

But life, happy or unhappy, is growth; and we are all, whether consciously or not, the product of our experience—which is our novel.

If, for the moment, we are happy—with only the cares of routine (without which we should be so unhappy that if we had them not, we should borrow other trouble)—we worry about the outcome of the story we are living. The present is too good to last; there must be rain after so long a spell of fair weather. We cannot be sure of the "happy ending"—for our novel never ends! As Professor Baker has remarked, one feels when the curtain goes down on a comedy that a tragedy has begun. Though one episode in our novel ends happily, there is always more to follow.

In the novels we read, it is the storm which attracts; it is so comfortable to hear the wind whistling outside while we are cosily ensconced by the fireplace! And, besides, none of it is real, anyway; if the rain stings us, we can always put the book back on the shelf, and, forgetting Quasimodo or Little Nell, take down another, less gloomy. The mystery—if it is a mystery we are after—will surely be cleared up before we reach the end; while the mysteries in life about us—the puzzles which we cannot understand—how will they all end? Edwin comes in to find Angelina out riding with Bertie—doesn't she love him? To his friends, Edwin may be a comic figure—not so to himself! for we can never forget the right perspective, can never see ourselves in a humorous light, when we are in love.

He may comfort himself with maxims—"the course of true love" is not expected to run smooth—but he cannot subdue the pang of jealousy which flourishes when there is love but not perfect faith. Highly entertaining to read, this; even amusing to watch; but infernal to live. If only one could turn over the pages to see how it was all coming out. . . .

Is the mountaineer sure, when he dangles over the cliff (as did Henry Knight), that he will be able to thrill his friends at supper with an account of his adventures? Is the financier positive that the *coup* will go through, and that he will not be forced into bankruptcy? The fact that we *don't* know how it is all going to turn out, lends a spiciness to the novels we live which no library can furnish.

And how we misunderstand our friends! How we misinterpret their silences—or their words! How we read between the lines—and often so mistakenly. How we seek for trouble, unknowingly, and how we, in our turn, are misunderstood! "Life is not necessarily the kind of thing we generally make it," as Stevenson has pointed out; but there is no kindly author at our elbow to show us the true state of affairs; we speak in veiled phrases, afraid to hurt people's feelings by making ourselves explicit. Surely many of our unwritten novels are muddled affairs; and the clue to their real meaning may not come to light until the heroes have ceased to exist, if, indeed, it is not lost forever! But who shall say that, when the silent novelist has finally come to his grave, there was not more pleasure than pain in the story of which he was the hero, and of which he alone could appreciate all the fine points? Even if his story were a tragedy, it reached greater heights than a comedy could ever attain; and whatever the sordidness of it, it had the element of nobility inherent in suffering. If our life-story would make a good book, our life-tragedy would make a great one; and if scars are a sign of pain, they may also mean glory in the battle of life.

Book Reviews

JEFFERSON AND HAMILTON: THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA.
By Claude G. Bowers. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin
Co., 1925. xvii, 531 pp.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON. By Francis W. Hirst. New
York: The MacMillan Company, 1926. xviii, 588 pp.

The approach of this sesquicentennial year of American Independence has received little attention from the general public. There has been very little blare of trumpets, even less tribute of oratory. However in the realm of scholarship and letters there has been, perhaps without conscious forethought of the approaching year, a distinct tendency to reconsider the men and the issues identified with the origins of our national existence. The political theories of the Revolution have been newly examined by Adams and McIlwaine, and a useful book of documents has been edited by Mr. Morrison; Mr. Van Tyne has undertaken a summary of his extensive investigations of the Revolution, Mr. Andrews has examined the origins of the revolt in the light of British policy before and after 1763, and Mr. Harlow's *Samuel Adams* reinterprets the radical in the light of psychology. The biographical works under review carry the consideration of national origins beyond the Revolution, through the lives of Jefferson and Hamilton; they may thus be considered as a sequel of the previous works dealing specifically with the Revolution.

In the studies of Mr. Bowers and Mr. Hirst there is a common denominator—that is the vindication of Jefferson, a new and favorable integration of his place in the politics of the nation. Such a view is to be expected from Mr. Bowers, for his former volume, *Party Battles of the Jackson Period*, was a vindication of the democratic movement and its leaders; but it is surprising in the case of Mr. Hirst, who is an Englishman and an economist, for the English tradition has exalted Hamilton above Jefferson and economists as a rule show no sympathy for Jeffersonian ideas of political economy. Indeed, Mr. Hirst goes out of his way to lambast Mr. Oliver's *Alexander Hamilton*, and he is just as captious regarding certain

remarks about Jefferson as war governor of Virginia in Eckenrode's *Virginia in the Revolution*. Nothing in recent biographical writing is more notable than this aggressive defense of the arch radical of early American thinkers by a British economist; it reverses all literary traditions.

Of the two books that of Mr. Bowers is the more valuable contribution. It shows a greater mastery of the sources of information, a keener insight into character, and more imagination. The author's art of interpreting character has distinctly improved since the *Party Battles of the Jackson Period*; and in the present, as in the former work, the most valuable sketches are those of men of minor importance. Especially worthy of mention are the delineations of Wolcott and Pickering, of McHenry and Fisher Ames, of Frenau and Gallatin. In the discussions of political issues due emphasis is placed on those questions which have been the subject of monographic investigation in recent years, notably the Jay Treaty. Throughout the book the dominant note is realism—the love of wealth, the selfish ambitions, the physical violence in political contests; certainly the golden age of the Republic was not the decade from 1790 to 1800. But rising above the sordid motives of the time are Jefferson and Hamilton; the former an organizer, finally crushed by the political structure of which he was the chief architect; the latter a born leader of men, triumphant because of his faith in human rights and democracy.

Mr. Hirst's *Life and Letters* is executed along the lines of British literary tradition, and has the virtues and the faults which characterize other examples of that tradition. There are no footnotes, even for quotations, and the author's personal opinions overshadow proof of or demonstration of his thesis. There is evidence of haste in the preparation of the book which is responsible for many slips, such as the failure to realize Jefferson's indebtedness to certain existing documents in drafting the Declaration of Independence. On the other hand there is the vitality and freshness of strong impressions, which too much meditation often vitiates. Such for example is the vindication of Jefferson from responsibility for the successful British invasion of Virginia in 1779. Throughout, the critics

of Jefferson are answered and all his achievements are praised. Of this the climax undoubtedly is the approval of Jefferson's conviction that "a pay as you go policy" should be adopted in time of war. Evidently Mr. Hirst does not approve of contemporary European financial policies, but both he and Jefferson overlook an important factor in the case, that of the existence or non-existence of undeveloped natural resources. Finally, Jefferson's political ideas are attributed to English origins, but Algernon Sydney is given greater credit than Locke or Harrington.

Defensive but stimulating, partisan but possessing insight—such is Mr. Hirst's contribution. That of Mr. Bowers is dramatic, yet fortified with details, more orientated in the life and thought of the eighteenth century, and a model of that new type of biography which makes an appeal to popular interest without sacrificing scholarship.

W. K. B.

ITALIAN LANDSCAPE IN EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND. By Elizabeth Wheeler Manwaring. (The Wellesley Semi-Centennial Series.) New York: Oxford University Press, 1925. xi, 243 pp.

This is a book which the specialist will find important and the general reader should find fascinating, even more so than the title alone could possibly suggest. For the author has presented the influence of Claude Lorrain and Salvator Rosa on English taste in the eighteenth century with charm as well as accuracy. The interest is much assisted by the copious illustrations and the format is worthy of the series in which the book is published.

Something notable and impressive happened to the taste for nature in the eighteenth century. The change which made the wilder aspects of scenery objects of admiration and rapture instead of toleration has been frequently noted, and has elicited various explanations. To call the change the passing from Classicism to Romanticism has satisfied those who search for labels, who live by catch-phrases. More valuable has been the suggestion that the influence of the deistic philosophers was a contributing cause. And now Miss Manwaring maintains the thesis that English eyes "were shocked by Salvator Rosa into

recognition of the 'beauty and fierceness' of wild and mountainous scenery"; that these landscapes, taken as models by poet, painter, and gardener, set new standards of picturesque beauty; that the long training from seeing landscape pictorially made the poets and painters at the end of the century discover beauty in hedge-rows and corn fields, in Hampstead and Mousehold Heaths.

The skill and completeness with which the evidence for this theory is presented call for unusual commendation. The vogue of the pictorial arts, the English knowledge and opinion of Claude and Salvator, the influence of these two upon gardener and poet—all these are well established. To make the comparison clearer, there is a sound treatment of English interest in scenery at the opening of the eighteenth century; in which, for once, Addison's remarks about the Alps have not been misunderstood. That this vogue for the picturesque influenced novelist and romancer as well as poet is also well brought out, and aids much in making the study complete.

The general reader will find many things of interest. If he is a fancier of prints, he will be amused and perhaps astonished at the vogue this form of art attained. Lovers of English scenery will be charmed with early accounts of the Lakes, the Wye Valley, and the Peak of Derbyshire. There is information about travel, about English gardens on the continent, the Chinese gardens, the artistic education of young ladies, and directions how to build false ruins and Gothic cattle sheds. The wealth of anecdote is surprising and refreshing. For example, Boswell's account of the two English travelers in the long picture gallery at Florence is quoted; they looked at pictures until finally "their impatience burst forth, and they tried for a bet who should hop first to the end." One is grateful for Owen Cambridge's remark to "Capability" Brown, that he hoped to die before Brown so that he might see heaven "in its unimproved state."

Here is scholarship without pedantry, a discriminating sense of proportion, a gusto in writing, even a sense of humour. It would be hard to see how the book could be better.

ROGER P. McCUTCHEON.

Tulane University.

ISRAEL. By Ludwig Lewisohn. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1925.
xv 280 pp.

This is not a book about the Jewish problem. It is a call to the Jewish people written with all the passion of an ancient prophet.

There is a real Jewish problem. Lewisohn begins his book with the bitter remark of a successful Jewish surgeon, "We simply aren't wanted anywhere." And the effect of this on Jewish life is likely to be tragic. On the one hand the Jew clings to his racial heritages, he is proud of Jewish achievements, and controls his world with the instincts of his Jewish blood. On the other hand he feels the bite of social stigma, hates his Jewish nose, apes his Gentile neighbors, ardently desires their recognition, and tries desperately to prove that he is an hundred per cent American. He is likely to suffer that most serious result of all ostracism—that he accepts the estimate of himself which is held by the dominant group.

Assimilation, says Lewisohn, is not the solution. It is natural that it should be tried. The majority in whose presence and power the Jewish minority the world over lives demands assimilation. It is suspicious of all who are different. It wants uniformity of taste and character. Its fundamental psychology is that of the herd. But no sooner does the Jew begin to accept the invitation and to lose himself in the culture of his adopted land and to occupy posts of leadership and distinction, than there arises the cry of the Ku Klux and the Pan-Germans, that an alien influence is entering and destroying our Nordic culture. For the Jew cannot cease to be a Jew, no matter how much he may desire to assimilate himself. He cannot lose his national character "simply because history cannot be relieved." And thus remaining a Jew he can never satisfy the demand of the majority for complete, absolute assimilation. It has always been the case and will be, says Lewisohn, that the answer to Jewish assimilation is Anti-Semitism. The clearest illustration of this is to be found in Germany, where Jewish assimilation was furthest advanced and Anti-Semitism was born.

But there is another Jewish problem. It is found in Poland, in Italy, in Hungary, in the Balkans. Here the Jewish minor-

ities are suffering from the same methods of brutal disregard of minority rights which the old regime of Russia so openly practised. In Italy a Fascist organization has been formed with the avowed purpose of clearing at least sixty-three counties of Jews. In Rumania the Jewish students are driven from the universities. Poland, created by the allies as an example of their liberation of subject peoples, is exercising toward her Jewish population a systematic policy of exploitation and oppression. Pogroms continue in Warsaw and in Lodz.

There is one refuge and only one, the land of the fathers, the land of Palestine. The great powers have at last declared that the Jews have an historic right there. The Council of the League of Nations in drawing up its Palestine Mandate instructed Great Britain to "place the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home." Already about one hundred and twenty thousand Jews are there, and immigrants are coming in at the rate of three thousand a month. Jewish skill is digging wells, damming streams, draining swamps, planting trees, establishing schools and hospitals, introducing scientific agriculture and breeding. The conditions are most difficult. The immigrants are poor and the land not yet reclaimed. Every acre of it must be bought from the Arab. It is an adventure primarily of the spirit. These pioneers do not expect wealth, but they do seek to find freedom, freedom to be themselves.

No one expects all Jewry to return. On the contrary, it is estimated that the land will only sustain a Jewish population of three million. Few will come from the west. But Palestine does not exist for itself alone; it exists for the Jewish people everywhere in the world. Its upbuilding will mean the spiritual rebirth of the Jewish soul. This is the first time in many ages that Jews have had a chance to do the productive work of civilization, to build cities, to reclaim waste lands, to create their own literature and art, to make a contribution to the world's culture that will be distinctly Jewish. "The upbuilding of Palestine has become the test and symbol and decision in the councils of the nations and the consciousness of mankind. We shall henceforth be a people, a pacifist and creative people, but a peo-

ple—or else we shall enter a worse than mediaeval period and drag our Jewishness through the world in the guise of a secret pestilence and a hidden shame.”

Zionism is thus a cultural revival of the greatest interest and a pilgrim adventure worthy of the highest praise. The book is primarily for Jews, but it deserves a wider reading both because Ludwig Lewisohn can write English with such beauty and precision as few native sons of the language can claim, and because such windows into the deepest aspirations and hopes of other social groups is the only panacea for the world's racial wounds.

HARVIE BRANSCOMB.

THE MELTING POT MISTAKE. By Henry Pratt Fairchild. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1926. 261 pp.

A HISTORY OF AMERICAN IMMIGRATION: 1820-1924. By George M. Stephenson. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1926. 302 pp.

Here are two books, dealing with the same subject, yet differing widely in point of view, in purpose and in method. Professor Fairchild has approached the subject of immigration from a frankly propagandist point of view. The title in itself proclaims that the writer has arrived at a judgment and that it is his purpose to support that judgment with such arguments as he can muster. Professor Fairchild is distinctly a nationalist, and lays down the thesis that the very existence of a nation depends upon the maintenance of a high degree of national homogeneity. The presence of masses of unassimilated foreigners makes inevitable the conflict of diverse systems of thought, without the probability of the triumph of one of these systems or the possibility of amalgamation of the elements of each into a harmonious whole. Morals, customs and political institutions of nations may be wholly unlike, yet particularly adapted to the characteristics of each nation. National stability, nevertheless, is endangered if permanently conflicting ideals and institutions exist within a pseudo-nationality. Hence it is not a question of the superiority of American characteristics and attributes over those of any other nationality, but of the superiority of a stable and unified nationality to a welter of heterogeneous races and nationalities incapable of achieving

intellectual or spiritual unity. Professor Fairchild therefore definitely takes ground not merely as the defender of threatened American nationality, but as an exponent and protector of nationalism in general against internationalism and mongrelization. The deductive method is used to support the nationalistic point of view, and to prove that mass assimilation is a practical impossibility on account of insuperable biological and sociological difficulties.

The absence of statistical evidence for the author's conclusions and the almost total lack of references to primary sources are regrettable, since the belief in the inadequacy of the "Melting Pot" has long been popularly accepted, and the development of a particularized and authenticated investigation of this inadequacy rather than a re-statement of the nationalists' aversion to international hybridization would seem to afford a greater opportunity to a writer of reputation on the problems of immigration.

In his *History of American Immigration*, Professor Stephenson has made an interesting and useful contribution to the literature of the subject. The book is well documented, and careful workmanship is in evidence throughout the volume. An excellent classified bibliography of immigration is a noteworthy feature. The division of the work into three parts devoted to the European background, the immigrants in America, and Oriental immigration, seems well advised, although strict logic might have required the division of the Oriental immigration problem along the same lines as the European; however, the much greater importance of the European immigration justifies the plan followed.

The portion of the work devoted to the immigrant in politics is particularly valuable, although it is marred in places by the apparently irrepressible tendency of the author to express his approval or disapproval of certain policies, which, while important as affecting the immigrant in politics, do not seem to necessitate the gratuitous approval or condemnation of the historian of immigration. As cases in point, are his references on pages 220 and following to the foreign policy of Woodrow Wilson as "clean cut," to Mr. Wilson's speech of acceptance as

"dignified, calm and convincing," and to Mr. Hughes' speeches as "disappointing to those who believed the times called for plain speaking." Likewise the statement on page 280 that "the American press felt that the senators had acted like school boys in response to the note of the Japanese ambassador," indicates the difficulty which all writers seem to experience in examining such a controversial matter as immigration from an unemotional and disinterested angle, even if the angle be that of the painstaking and impartial historian.

CALVIN B. HOOVER.

THRASYMACHUS OR THE FUTURE OF MORALS. By C. E. M. Joad. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1926. 88 pp.

Two earlier little books in the To-day and To-morrow Series I may have taken lightly—that on the future of the theatre and that on the future of poetry. This on the future of morals is to be taken earnestly. Mr. Joad is a scientific moralist. The old idea of morals as a holy deliverance from the sanctified past does not interest him. The old fiction of a "God" with a vested and managerial interest in our planet he disdains as easily as orthodox Christians disdain Zeus or Zoroaster. In a word, morality is snatched from the sheltering arms of religion and exposed to the cold dry light of the natural and social sciences.

The situation is this. In any community power lies with the strong. In a democracy strength means numbers. Hence morality in a democracy is based upon the conduct or desires of the majority, which we may contemptuously call the herd. The herd naturally approves itself and disapproves those who think or act differently. That is, immorality is social non-conformity. Moreover, since religion has always exerted its spiritual influence by means of social influence (is not one half of the Decalogue, for example, ethical rather than religious?), the herd has enormously strengthened its power by uniting with and absorbing the church. Finally, the majority when they act in concert act unintelligently—(will any one question this?)—and when they act under guidance are directed by a selfish minority interested chiefly in maintaining its own prerogatives and perquisites of power.

It is one of the great ironies of civilization that as knowledge slowly broadens down into the lower classes, the lower classes become more narrow and more arrogant. They feel the oats of influence, and recognizing what is only too true, that they have been long oppressed and abused, proceed to repress and abuse, as successfully as they can, their enemy, the minority. At present we have dropped into the trough of the wave;—the brutal error of the World War gave the "proletarians" their chance. Economically they assert themselves to considerable effect; politically their experiments are giving only moderate satisfaction; morally they are in the way of soon making Saints and Martyrs of us all.

The question for the future of morals is how to shake off this tyranny of standardized Puritanism with its attendant hypocrisy that is all the worse for being partly unconscious, or at least to leaven and enlighten it with intelligence and a genuine religious spirit—genuine in contrast to traditionary. Certain present tendencies, such as the decay of the family through the growing economic independence of women and the spread of contraceptive propaganda, will momentarily strengthen the reactionaries. Mr. Joad looks for a new and more violent Puritanism in the next fifty years, to be followed, he hopes, by "a new and positive morality in which men can believe."

In sum, "Thrasymachus" is a dangerous and captivating little book. The pious man who dips into it will be shocked within an inch of his life. The intelligent man who reads it through will certainly understand himself and his social standards better than he did before.

PAULL F. BAUM.

PLANTS AND MAN. By F. O. Bower. London: The Macmillan Company, 1925. 365 pp.

The title of this book would lead one to believe that it is a treatise on economic botany. By many who are interested in plants and who realize their vast importance to human life, such a work would probably be eagerly welcomed. On second thought, however, one soon realizes that the subject of economic botany is too vast a field to be covered in a single volume of three hundred and sixty-five pages. For this reason no such

book of any value has so far appeared, although books on the various phases of the subject are quite numerous. The publication which comes nearest to being an adequate comprehensive treatment on economic botany is *Baily's Cyclopaedia of American Agriculture and Horticulture*, which comprises eight large volumes.

If *Plants and Man* is not a book on economic botany, then what is it, if the title is justifiable? The relation of plants to man may, of course, be looked at from various points of view. These may be classified into the following headings: (1) historical, (2) geographical, (3) technical, and (4) botanical. The historical point of view deals with the relation of plants to man at different times and in different ages, including the origin and development of uses and methods. From the geographical point of view one considers the relation of plants to man in the different parts of the world, as well as the geographical origin of our economic plants. The technical part of economic botany deals with the modern practices in horticulture and agriculture. Then plants in relation to man may be looked at from the view point of the plants themselves, which is the botanical point of view. This treats of the botanical origin of economic plants, the direct and indirect influence of human life upon plant life, and the significance of plant structures and physiology in relation to the service plants render to human life. This last point of view is the chief one which has been presented in this volume. It is unique, and is an attempt by a technical and experienced botanist to popularize the subject of modern botany.

The book consists of a collection of essays most of which were published in the *Glasgow Herald* in 1924. The subjects discussed in the different chapters have a wide range, representing both the technical and the more popular phases of botany. Several chapters are devoted to the structure and physiology of plants, while others deal more with the direct economic phases of the subject, such as the flower and vegetable gardens, fruits and grains, the meadow, the relation of plants to seasons, etc. Although the book is well written, its style is a little too much like that of a textbook to make it readable for the average

person, and since the essays were not written originally with the intention of publishing them in book form, the organization is more or less incoherent. But whatever may be said against it, it is at least authentic and what we seem to need at present is more popular books on scientific subjects written by authorities.

H. L. BLOMQUIST.

THE NEUROSES OF THE NATIONS. By C. E. Playne. New York: Thomas Seltzer, 1925. 468 pp.

Miss Playne presents here a psychological interpretation of the origins of the World War of considerable originality and of marked interest. The author accepts as her point of departure the theories of group psychology which appear in the writings of Le Bon, Trotter, McDougall and others. Nations, like any other groups, are therefore assumed to have a collective mentality which may become unbalanced as the individual's mind may be affected by disease.

The larger part of this bulky volume is devoted to the growth of unhealthy mental conditions in the German and French "group minds." More unsophisticated than the French, or as the author expresses this idea, more inclined to wear their hearts upon their sleeves, the Germans were the first to reveal this tendency in expressions of exalted nationalism. This phase of German public opinion since 1870, like the pretentious bearing of the newly rich, may be explained as the result of intoxication due to her extraordinary material success and fears aroused by her somewhat insecure position. In France, although similar manifestations were not unknown in the earlier days of the Third Republic, her particular "neurosis" reached its culmination with the *fin de siècle* mood of disillusionment and sophistication and with the wave of militarism which followed in the first years of the twentieth century. All European nations are represented, in a greater or less degree, as approaching insanity under the pressure of unprecedented demands upon nervous energy entailed by the complexities of modern life. The war came in 1914, not because statesmen willed it, but because they were carried off their feet by "certain currents of group-emotional passion and mental aberration."

The novelty of this thesis, while probably insuring a wide audience for the book, may in fact lead to mistaken notions as to its permanent value. I cannot agree with the publisher that it has been elaborated with "thorough, convincing scholarship." It is by no means clear that the author is adequately prepared either as a psychologist or as an historian. The reader is not only expected to accept on faith the validity of the new psychology, but also to assume that its methods and terminology may be used with satisfactory results in the study of nations. Our knowledge of what constitutes national consciousness is unfortunately too meager for the facile use of such terms as *neurosis*, *melancholia*, *hysteria* and *insanity*, which fairly sprinkle these pages.

But, assuming the reality of the "group mind" with reference to the nation, what is the proper procedure in diagnosing its maladies? It is of essential importance, first of all, to distinguish between the various groups into which all nations are divided and to weigh carefully their respective contributions to the nation's mind. This can only be done after a critical study of the diverse agencies for the expression of public opinion, especially in periods of international crises.

Although Miss Playne's reading has been extensive, it falls far short of this standard. In the case of Germany, main reliance is placed in the summaries of Pan-German opinion collected by Nippold and Rohrbach, and in the observations of contemporaries. This may be valuable evidence, but the author is silent in regard to the credibility and influence of these witnesses. No use has been made of either German or French newspapers. In her study of the French group-mind, Miss Playne deals mostly with the writings of certain men, such as Prevost-Paradol, Abbé Dimnet, Bazin, Barrès, and Maurras, who are said to be especially sensitive to prevailing moods. These writers were admittedly read by a relatively few, but the author believes that their value is in no sense lessened by this fact. This is indeed strange. If they expressed ideas which were current among the French nation, presumably their public would have been large. We reach more solid ground in dealing with the influence of chauvinistic text-books upon French education since 1870; nevertheless it is necessary to know how uni-

versal was their use. It is to be regretted that the author did not also study the character of German texts.

After making due allowance for these weaknesses, the book still remains important. It especially calls attention to the need of studying international relations from a broader point of view than that of diplomacy. It should also be useful for its numerous quotations from books which are not always easily available.

E. MALCOM CARROLL.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE INTERNATIONAL COURT. By Frances Kellor and Antonia Hatvany. New York: Thomas Seltzer, 1925. xix, 353 pp.

This book was published shortly before the United States Senate, by its action of January 27, 1926, had given its advice and consent to adhesion by the United States to the Protocol of Signature of the Permanent Court of International Justice, with certain reservations. Its value is not diminished because of this fact. For in the process of securing the assent of other nations to the conditions adopted by the Senate, it is to be expected that all or many of the questions discussed in the book will be encountered. To the average citizen the World Court is apt to take the form of a far-distant thing, the significance of which is not easily grasped, especially when it is obscured by a mass of propaganda, wholesome or otherwise. Any work having for its object to shed some additional light upon this important phase of American foreign policy merits consideration.

The volume does, in the opinion of the reviewer, make several important contributions to the wide-spread discussion of participation by the United States in the work of the World Court. In the first place, it goes into the history of the Court and its relations with other bodies, including the League of Nations; it presents in brief form the principal facts with reference to the establishment of the Court and its functioning during the four years it has been in existence. A synopsis at the beginning gives in convenient form the captions of the three hundred sections into which the work is divided.

In addition to presenting a convenient statement of what the Court is and of what activities have been, the authors have accomplished another object believed to be worth while.

Emphasis is placed upon the important fact that the World Court cannot be regarded in isolation, but can only be considered, in fairness, as one of a number of agencies in existence for the purpose of promoting amicable settlement of international disputes. Without agreeing with many of the authors' statements in regard to the relation between the Court and the League, the reader is impressed with the idea that the Court cannot be dissociated from other machinery of the system of which it is a part. It is merely one of many agencies which should work together in the interest of world peace. In addition to it are bodies for inquiry and conciliation instituted by the Council of the League, the Conference of Ambassadors to deal with boundary questions under the Peace Treaties, the Reparations Commission, Mixed Arbitral Tribunals, special arbitration tribunals created for particular purposes, the Permanent Court of Arbitration, and Conciliation Commissions such as those contemplated under the Locarno agreements.

In the third place, the book furnishes brief but clear discussions of particular phases of the World Court question. Among these may be mentioned the matter of obligatory jurisdiction, and the reasons which led to the rejection of the obligatory jurisdiction feature proposed by the Committee of Jurists who drafted the original plan for the World Court (pp. 65-67). The Locarno treaties and the bearing which the latter may have upon the general question of obligatory settlement, movements for the outlawry of war, the question of sanctions, and the codification of international law, are also given some attention. A review of various proposals for participation of the United States in the Court is now of some historical interest. Included in the appendices are texts of some of the more important documents relating to the Court, and summaries of advisory opinions and judgments which the Court has rendered.

It is difficult for the reader to escape the impression, however, that the authors of the book have been biased against everything connected with the League of Nations. Throughout the work reference is made to the League in such a way as to convey the idea that the organization is something like "political and military alliance," as President Harding pictured it. The manner of approach to the question of the United States and the Court is marked by this attitude. The whole

group of bodies instituted by or constituting a part of the system of the League seem to be considered as things to be avoided by means of all the safe-guards which can be devised. The idea is advanced that the League (through the Covenant, particularly Article 14) can and does shape the policies of the World Court. But endorsement of the World Court should be accomplished, in some safe way, in order to fulfill the pledge of the Republican administration to the people of the United States.

Many assertions in the book are open to criticism. Among other things it is said that "the use of the Hague Organization (the Permanent Court of Arbitration) for nominations places it in a subordinate capacity within the League System" (p. 30), and that "the act of the Court in making nominations (of members of arbitration tribunals) thus becomes tributary to arbitral tribunals" (p. 96). From the standpoint of clearness and accuracy, at least, such statements leave something to be desired. It is difficult to agree with the authors that during the past three years the policies of the League and the Court have become "fixed" (p. 235). Has the Court been in existence long enough to justify such conclusions?

Advisory opinions are considered at some length, and the practice of the World Court in the matter of giving advisory opinions is compared with that in the American States where advisory opinions are used. Conclusions offered in regard to advisory opinions (e.g., the highly conjectural use of an advisory opinion suggested on page 170) are not entirely convincing.

Comparing the reservations and conditions advocated by the authors in their concluding chapter with those actually adopted by the Senate shortly after the publication of this book, it is found that they are not substantially different except in one important respect. Whereas the Senate was willing to have the United States participate in the election of judges, the authors would have the country "not participate in the election of judges nor in the execution of sanctions . . . until such time as Congress may authorize the assumption of such duties and prescribe the method of participation by the United States."

ROBERT R. WILSON.

INDIANS OF THE ENCHANTED DESERT. By Leo Crane. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1925. x + 364 pp.

To one who has lived in the Far West with its broad expanses, and has been through a part of the Enchanted Desert, this book lifts him figuratively out of his existing environment and plants him in the land of the Mesas and the Mirage. For Leo Crane has caught the "feel" of it. He went out originally for his health, but he found far more, a something which can only be experienced, and cannot be conveyed by word of mouth or by pen. It all looks barren and desolate, and yet one begins to long for it, with its real cañons and its sunshine, when one has worn out much shoe leather in the caverns of our cities. The author has the happy combination of knowing how to write, and at the same time of knowing the facts. He had a longer term as Indian Agent among the Hopi Indians of Arizona than any others of his maligned ilk. One comes to feel that some Indian agents are worth their salt. Respect rises as the list of things an agent has to do is recited and developed through the volume. We may talk about being prosecuting attorney, judge and jury, all in one, but to the agent such a task would be easy, for in addition to being all of these he has at least a dozen other activities, each of which takes as much time, if not more, than any of his duties as judge and prosecutor and jailor and hangman, all in one. Leo Crane has a kind heart toward all those whom he met out in the desert, but to one class particularly he has an aversion, even though he bears with them patiently. These are the Sentimentalists, the men and women who go out to paint and to enjoy, and to nose around and to go back and give complete descriptions of the religion and the social life and the wonderful dances of the Indians. Mr. Crane has lived among the Hopi long enough to see how falacious are the conclusions most of these Sentimentalists reach. He believes the Indians are very interesting, but he does not think that the wild Indian in his native state is a very clean animal. The book almost might be said to culminate in the description of the famous snake dances. These are annual festivals, with the purpose of bringing the rain, which must fall to keep even the Hopi alive, and that is saying much, for these Hopi seem to be

able to live on as few drops of water as any people known on earth.

For anyone who desires to get his mind away from civilization, though he must remain just where he is, scarcely any book could be mentioned which would enable him to do so better than this. The best part of it all would be that, while he would be enjoying the experience to the full, he was being told true things and that the impressions which he had formed would be as correct as is possible for one who has not actually lived in the Enchanted Desert himself.

EDMUND D. SOPER.

DIARY AND LETTERS OF JOSEPHINE PRESTON PEABODY. Selected and Edited by Christina Hopkinson Baker. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1925. 346 pp.

For thirty-two years Josephine Preston Peabody kept a diary, and all that time she was also writing copious and frequent letters to her friends. The editor's task in compressing these intimate records within the compass of a modest volume must have been perplexing. Christina Baker has chosen, perhaps rightly, the extracts that represent most fully Mrs. Marks' literary progress. The entries and letters of the apprentice years when the obstinate persistence of this slip of a girl finally won recognition, form an almost heroic chapter. The Cinderella-like contrast between those days and the festival time when *The Piper* ushered her to triumphs at Stratford and London make an engaging narrative.

But it is not so much Josephine Peabody's story that interests us, as it is her *self*. The jacket display lines which compare her diary with that of Bashkirtseff make an unnecessary claim. To say that it has quite as individual in charm as *Celia Thaxter's Letters* or the *Life of Alice Freeman Palmer* would sufficiently tempt the American reader.

It is good to know that there are more of these letters and journals still unpublished. Perhaps Mrs. Marks' publishers may be encouraged to bring out a second volume of them. They would form as distinct an addition to Mrs. Peabody's works as would a new volume of her uncollected verses.

SANDFORD SALYER.

SLAVONIC NATIONS OF YESTERDAY AND TODAY. By M. S. Stanoyevich.
New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1925. 415 pp.

This volume is a part of the publisher's Handbook Series. It is comprised of reprints of articles, chiefly from American and English periodicals, dealing with various questions concerning either the Slavic peoples in general or with the various Slavic states. Almost half of the book is devoted to articles on Russia, and it is worthy of note that the Bolshevik point of view is given expression in essays by Lenin, Radek and Krasin. There is a certain convenience in having these articles in book form; the service would have been greater, however, had more articles been drawn from foreign publications.

There is also a bibliography of articles which have not been reprinted, but there is no index.

E. M. C.

THE ENCHANTED GARDEN. By John Erskine. Chicago: The Bookfellers, 1925. 75 pp.

Unfortunately the author has reviewed his own book for us in a prefatory note, as follows:

"When I wrote this allegory, some time ago, I was occupied with reflections on the nature of Imagination, of Illusion and of Disillusion, and I amused myself by projecting some of my thoughts and moods into this phantasy. The Princess is meant to represent . . ., and Tommy is . . . Each incidental fable is designed to . . ."

I say 'unfortunately' because in explaining his allegory he has spoiled his phantasy. The allegory would be clear enough to any one who deserved to comprehend it; and the conclusions on the nature of illusion and scepticism are neither profound nor significant. But his phantasy—except where he has allowed the expository machinery to intrude and where he has indulged in what he has himself condemned as morbid self-analysis—is entirely delightful both for its pleasant humor and for the beauty of its prose. One may boldly admit that there is more beauty in "The Enchanted Garden" than in Professor Erskine's verse.

P. F. B.

FALSTAFF AND OTHER SHAKESPEAREAN TOPICS. By Albert Tolman. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925. x, 270 pp.

MRS. SHAKESPEARE'S SECOND MARRIAGE. By Dr. Appleton Morgan. New York: The Shakespeare Society of New York, 1926. 63 pp.

About half of the seventeen papers in the first of these volumes are reprinted, after the manner of the German *Ver-sammelte Schriften*, from the *Publications of the Modern Language Association* and *Modern Language Notes*, those admirable trade-journals of the American college professor. One is a radio-talk in words of one syllable on the so-called Bacon-Shakespeare question. Another—forty-odd pages on the Early History of Shakespeare's Reputation—is Professor Tolman's inaugural address as President of the Chicago Literary Club. The others are short studies on such topics as Malvolio's Puritanism and the Treatment of Shakespeare's Text, or extended notes and comments on Lear and Julian Cæsar. All are interesting to the unprofessional as well as the professional student. Professor Tolman is rich in quotation and very "bien documenté." In fact, some of the papers are rather like pastiches from original works of learning and investigation, carefully chosen selections such as one offers in the class-room to show the "results" of scholarship while concealing its laborious processes. They may lack the grace and charm that one expects in the best popular presentation of scholarly investigation, but for precisely this reason they possess a clearness and simplicity very satisfying to the reader who wants facts and not flourishes.

Dr. Morgan's little work (No. 14 of the *Papers of the New York Shakespeare Society*), genially but none too lucidly written and very badly proof-read, is a sally into the tangle of conjecture and conflicting "evidence" of Shakespeare biography. His hypothesis is that Mrs. Anne Shakespeare, having married after her first husband's death a certain Richard James and become violently Puritan, retained the manuscripts of the sixteen plays (salvaged by Shakespeare himself from the piratical printers) which do not appear in our "Quartos," and that at her death in 1623 the said Richard James sold them to Blount and Jaggard, the publishers of the First Folio. Along with this are sundry smaller controversial matters which rather obscure

the main argument and tempt to further controversy—not to be undertaken in a brief review.

P. F. B.

BOYS' OWN ARITHMETIC. By Raymond Weeks. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1924. xv, 188 pp.

This amusing little book of problems for people of all ages sparkles with wit from beginning to end. The reader wonders at first why it is called an Arithmetic; but he does not fail to notice how gripping it would be if, instead of the usual manuals which are full of columns of examples which neither amuse nor stimulate the imagination, this book were put in the hands of our youth.

But this is not all. These problems are inimitable little stories suggested by episodes from mythology, history, literature, folk material and incidents from the author's own experience. It is delightful to find old friends again thus freshly handled and to make the acquaintance of others whom we never knew. Here are the names of some of the problems: *Hound Dog Percy*, *Flight of Ducks*, *Lafayette's Dancing Partner*, *Late at Browning Club*, *Red Mule Absalom*, etc. From the titles some idea of the degree of concentration of the author's style can be guessed. He has succeeded in reproducing the air of a small country life such as he sees in the country around Sabot, Virginia, where he lives. In a few lines he exposes a complete setting, situation and action, and many of the stories are full of keen observations as to the way a human acts under various circumstances. If some of the adventures recounted are entirely impossible, they are none the less quite probable!

Incongruity, lack of respect, repetition, ridicule, self-consciousness, caricature—none of the elements of humor are lacking. The preface should be read, for it does not stand in the way of the enjoyment of the book. The author states there that some of the problems, like those of life, cannot be solved. These very problems, however, are capable of stimulating a quiescent mind, a latent ambition, a puerile imagination. It is impossible to read the book without admiring the mental alertness of the writer, his genius for suggestion, and his striking originality in handling his subject matter.

JULIAN EARLE HARRIS.

Madison, Wisconsin.

